

Truth's Conflict with Error,

OR,

# Univerſall Redemption CONTROVERTED,

In three Publike  
**DISPUTATIONS**

The firſt between M. *John Goodwin*, and  
M. *Vavasour Powell*, in Coleman-  
ſtreet LONDON.

The other two between M. *John Goodwin*,  
and M. *John Simpson*, at Alhallowes  
the great in Thames-ſtreet :

In the preſence of divers Miniſters of the City of  
London, and thouſands of others.

---

1 Cor. 13. 5. Examine your ſelves whether ye be in the faith, prove your own  
ſelves, &c.

Prov. 18. 13. He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and ſhame  
unto him.

Prov. 29. 11. A fool uttereth all his mind, but a wiſeman keepeth it in reſtraint.

---

London: Printed by Robert Aſtlin on Adlin-Hill. 1650

THE COURT OF COMMONS

OF

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
CONTROLLED

DISTINCTIONS

The first between M. John Goodwin, and  
M. Nathaniel Powell, in Common  
their London

The other two between M. John Goodwin  
and M. John Simpson, in Affiliations  
the present names their

In the presence of others witnesses of each of  
London, and thousands of others.

1. College of Arts, which was held on the 1st of June 1650.  
2. College of Arts, which was held on the 1st of June 1650.  
3. College of Arts, which was held on the 1st of June 1650.  
4. College of Arts, which was held on the 1st of June 1650.

London: Printed by Robert Aspin on Adm. Hill. 1650.



A. S.  
To the Reader.

Good Reader,

**W**Hat ever becoms of the Controversie yet depending, or on which side soever the truth shall fall concerning the intencion of God the Father in the death of his Son, and the nature and kind of his Decrees, to be sure the law of life established in heaven, is both inviolable and irreversible herein, that the crown of life it must be run for; and it is not a seeking, but a striving, that must carry it. It is true what the Wiseman saith, that knowledge is easie to him that will understand, yet not to every loose or faint desire, but to the strength of such a will, which through desire doth separate it self to intermeddle with all wisdom. For, it is with truth the off-spring of the God of truth, as it is with God himself, who though he be light, and in him there is no darknesse at all, yet is he said sometimes to make darknesse his pavilion round about him, and to veile the light of his glory till we seek him diligently: Even such is the nature of truth, especially of such which are enriched with excellency, and have a proper tendency to enrich the creature accordingly, there is a holy disdain and secret digress in them (as it were) to be beheld, or looked upon with common thoughts and apprehensions, but they do require a singularness of intencion, and raisednesse of mind and spirit, to go forth to meet them. Nothing fills the world in generall with more complaints at this day, nor the Commonwealth of Christians in particular with more divisions, and thereupon with great thoughts of hearts, then the diversity of opinions or apprehensions rather concerning Truth. Which notwithstanding, did not the voluntary and affected ignorance of some, the petulancy and forwardnesse of others, and the supine negligence and remissnesse of most too much indulge and cherish, might have received a great allay before this. Buy the truth (saith Solomon) but sell it not: Earnestly contend for the faith (saith the Apostle) which was once delivered unto the Saints: And precious is our Saviours advice, Call no man Master upon earth, for one is your Master which is in heaven. Too excellent above measure is the nature of the soule to be subjugated to the lawes and edicts of men; No, it must confesse its soveraigne Lord, from whom it received its being, and at whose will and pleasure it must be for ever. And too invaluable is that pearle of price (the truth of the Gospel) to be found without much seeking, yea without much searching and inquiring after. Which being so, doth add much weight and worth to this and such like engagements, and pleads their righteousness and equity with a lip of excellency. For should that question now be resumed againe and put to many, which was sometime put to Christ, What is Truth? I meane in the particularities of it as they have been received and acknowledged, doubtlesse, many pretenders to this understanding would fall short in point of answer.

A 2

## To the Reader.

daily experience in all ages witnessing and sealing to it, (which in some measure (me thinks) should heal the offence which comes by it) that as one Generation passeth, and another comes, the former resigning up, and giving place to the latter; so those Conceptions of Truth which have lookt very loose, for a season, after a time they have lost their beauty, the shining of a clearer light detecting them of weaknesse, and expelling them as darknesse, for though the night be far past, and the day at hand, yet such is the nature of Truth, as that of Light, to shine yet more and more unto the perfect day. What thou hast here presented to thy view, I nothing doubt but thou didst either here, or els hast heard of, the sound of it having gone forth both far and neare, neither was it done in a corner. The ground and reason of the first original writing was mainly this, to prefer the honour of Truth in the discovery and manifestation of it, together with the integrity of the engaged Parties, or otherwise to recover their innocency from under that slander and calumny, which ignorance and prejudice might be apt to cast upon them, upon such engagements, experience whereof hath been too manifest in this particular, through too much credulity (that epidemical weaknesse of many) to believe every thing. That thou wast no sooner presented with it, the interposition of indispensable occasions otherwise must plead for it. Take it as it was, or well could be taken without further Rhetorick or Arithmetick, nor the least material addition, or Substraction, onely some impervinent Multiplication, first divided, and then cancell'd. And this be pleased to take not upon a single accompt, but upon a three-fold testimony: first duely comparing, consenting, and agreeing in one. That which I shall further add in reference to it is onely this, the nature of the Subject my hope is, will command an excellency of engagement, and the formall manner of transacting (so rarely seen or known in this our generation) no doubt but will add some further weight to the consideration of it. Beware of prejudice that great enemy of Truth and perverter of Justice. Labour with thy self what thou canst to behold a double object with a single eye. Look not in an oblique manner or angularly upon the persons, but with a direct and full aspect upon their respective Arguments and Conclusions: take heed of rash and hasty Inferences from inconsiderate and indulgested premises. First read, and then judge, and afterwards give sentence.

**John Weekes.**

## Postscript.

**G**ood Reader, to prevent thy stumbling at the threshold (the entrance of this Discourse) which otherwise thou canst not well avoid, be pleased to take notice, that there was a former meeting between Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Rowell, to which the first page relates, but nothing of consequence did then pass, onely something was spoken as to the starting of a Question, which should afterwards be discussed.

THE





THE FIRST  
DISPUTATION

BETWIXT

*Mr. John Goodwin,* and *Mr. Vavasour  
Powell,* in Coleman-street London,

Decemb. 31. 1649.

*M. J. Cranford,* } Moderators.  
*M. D. Lordell,* }

After the settling and composing themselves  
unto the Work, it began thus.

*Mr. Goodwin.*

**I**F it be thought meet that we make choice of  
Moderators, I shall desire that the same may  
Moderate who did before; though I will not  
restrain *Mr. Powell* of his liberty to choose  
whom he please: Only this lieth upon him or  
them that shall do it, to see that what is spo-  
ken be to the point, and to cut off all by-pas-  
sages, that so we may drive things to an issue; and that they do  
not ingage too much by way of disputation.

B

*Mr. Powell.*



*M. Powell.* I would make known to you, and to the Congregation, my thoughts both in relation to my self, and to the businesse in hand.

1. In relation to my self, I speak it in the presence of the Lord, his Angells, and People, who are present, that my thoughts were not in the least to contend with you, *Mr. Goodwin*, or with any of yours, out of any prejudice that I have to your person, or disaffection; for, God knowes how much I did love and respect you, and still do.

2. My thoughts, in bringing about the last meeting, were not to ingage in the way of dispute, but to come together and to discourse in a way of love and meeknesse, and to receive satisfaction one from another in those things wherein we differ.

3. In relation to my self, I look upon my self as others do, very unable and unfit to withstand *M. Goodwin* in a way of dispute, and therefore should be glad that others, who are firmer and better read in the controversie, would undertake the work.

4. If we shall do any thing this day in these particulars, I desire to do it with the spirit of love, according to the Gospell, not striving who shall have the conquest, but to cleare up the truth, for the glory of God, and the satisfaction of his people; not to fall into bitterness one against another: I am resolved (if I can) to restrain my own corruption; and so that God may not suffer dishonor, no matter what becoms of me: I desire that he may be glorified in me, though I go away with shame.

*M. Goodwin.* There is no man that shall exchange his opinion (supposing it to be an error for a truth) that shall need to say or fear that he shall suffer shame, that God may be glorified in him: for, the truth is, that he himself shall receive glory as well as God, by every such exchange: and certainly it is the greatest gain that any person under heaven (how great soever in wisdom and knowledg otherwise) can make, to make an exchange of his dross for silver, and of that which pollutes his conscience, for that which will make it shine, and that like to an Angel of God, which is by receiving and embracing the truth: And therefore upon that account we need not fear suffering of shame, or any disparagement, if we shall be convinced of error in our judgments.

ments; certainly it will be the best Market that ever we came at, the best bargain that ever we made in our lives.

And whereas you speak of your intention in the last meeting, if there had not been something precedent to it on your part, which made the acceptance of it more unworthy of you, I should have been glad to have heard those words from you: But if your desire and intent was to find out whether you or I had truth with us, you on your side, or I on mine, you should have done well to have forborne those undue (I may say) words, whereby you did asperse both me, and those that relate to me in this way; I cannot say in publike, as in the Pulpit, or upon the Exchange, but before many, and to censure and adjudge men, or to reflect any thing in an oblique manner by way of disparagement, before you know whether guilt, or any such unworthinesse or no be found with them, I conceive it was not faire nor Christian, otherwise I approve of what you say, and desire you so much grace from God, that you may keep up close to those ingagements, and not be a transgressor of your owne Law.

*M. Pow.* Give me leave to speak one word.

*M. Good.* Itwenty, so they will be fruitfull.

*M. Pow.* I know not any thing of what you lay to my charge, the last day you spake it, and now say it again, but God and my owne conscience know not of any such thing.

*Stranger.* *I was present at that time, and shall testifie as near as I can, that M. Powell only made a supposition to M. Price, that he held some such thing.*

*M. Good.* Suppose you could come off upon these termes (I am no sinister interpreter of mens sayings or doings) yet those words and passages wherein you uttered your selfe to M. Price, (and who else was by I know not) I know not with what interpretation you will come off, if you speak like a man, but that they were disparaging and reflecting upon me: Yet whatever become of that, the last time before my face two or three times over, you appealed to the people, and laid this to my charge, that I would not suffer you to state your Question in your owne termes, whereas I did not retrain, nor no way prohibite you therein, only desired you to explaine your termes wherein you stated it.



M. John Price. The businesse of our former meeting was exten-  
trecall to what we now meet upon, we came then to this consideration,  
to find out some men sound in the Faith for the dispatch of some bu-  
sinesse then under consideration, and desiring to know who they were,  
M. Powell was pleased to reply to me, That he did not judge them  
who hold the Doctrine of Free-will, and falling from grace, as sound  
in the Faith: To that I replied, If you have any thing to say to me  
touching any such thing, I hope I should give a Christian account of  
it; and at last it came to this, that he profest he heard that I held  
such and such things, and that many godly and good Christians re-  
port many strange things to be held by M. Goodwin. I answered,  
that we had very hard measure from many of our Congregationall  
Brethren, we had indeed their good words for us, but we did find that  
our credit and rep[ut]e was much undermined by them: We did pro-  
fesse before association of Churches, though we did not practise it,  
and if any of the Christian Brethren had any thing to say against us  
touching doctrine or practice, we should give a very fair account of  
both to them.

M. Powell. Since you have related so much on your part,  
tell what answer I gave to you.

M. Price. You was saying to this purpose, that you did not hold  
such and such men meet to preach the Gospel, and you heard that I  
in particular held so and so, and also you heard from others, that  
M. Goodwin held so and so, not that you knew any thing your self,  
and yet at last you spake out that so it was.

M. Spencer. I desire that we may passe this by; for though  
M. Powell did speak a word that might a little reflect upon your  
Congregation, yet he did professe clearly, that he had such high  
thoughts of M. Goodwin and his Congregation, that he desired to  
reason together with them to see whether any such thing was so  
or no.

M. Powell. This is my witnesse, the testimony of my consci-  
ence, and here are many present can witnesse also that I would  
indeavour that there might bee a meeting of the Ministers and  
Elders of the Churches of London, that so there might be a  
right understanding of things between them.

M. Price. Sir, I verily believe that you are ingenuow, and have  
done nothing out of rancor.

M. Jess.



*M. Jess.* I desire to propound this to your consideration, because I perceive that *M. Powell's* gift doth not lie in a way of dispute, I rather desire that some other may be the party.

*M. Goodwin.* I suppose there is no man will preach a Doctrine, but he will give an account of it, and will be able to prove it, and so in a sense he is fit to dispute it.

*M. Powell.* I account not my self a disputer of this world.

*M. Goodwin.* He that disputeth the things of Iesus Christ, he is no disputer of this world.

*M. Powell.* I am come to maintain and assert in the plainest manner, according to the Scriptures, the truths that I do hold, and that other Pastors and Teachers of Christian Churches do hold; and *M. Goodwin* is come to maintaine that which he conceives to be truth, let us (as we are able) go on to maintain them for the glory of God, and the edification of the people.

*M. Goodwin.* We are upon the point agreed, only if so be you decline the name of a dispute, and that which it imports and exhibits, then if you will nominate and state your Doctrine in opposition to mine, and so argue it from the Scriptures, by considering the parts of it, first one, and then another, I shall be willing to admit of this conference between us.

*M. Powell.* With all my heart I agree to it.

At this turn *M. John Symphon* besought a blessing upon the undertaking, which done proceeded thus:

*M. Powell.* *M. Goodwin* hath offered it, and I am willing to consent to it, that each of us lay downe those things which we hold, and so to give Scriptures and Reasons for the maintaining thereof.

*M. Goodwin.* That was not my proposition, but the one half of it was; for since this meeting was to satisfie you in what I hold, (supposing my judgement to be erroneous, and yours orthodox and sound) my proposition was, that you would please to lay down your opinion which is contrary to mine, and so produce your proofs from Scripture one after another, that so we may see whether they will amount to the confirmation thereof, yea, or no.

*M. Jess.* You that were here the last time, please to make discovery how far was proceeded.

*M. Goodwin.*

*M. Goodwin.* It may be *M. Powell* may go more clearly to work, if he will propose his opinion contrary to mine, and first see if it be so, and then produce his proofs of it; and in case his Doctrine shall be found contrary to mine, and if he can prove it, then I will submit.

*M. Powell.* For my part I shall very willingly and freely accept of this way, as conceiving it the best to understand the truth; for my aim is to know wherein we differ, and how we may come to be reconciled. I offered three things the last time, and shall now endeavour to prove them; I conceive by what I heard from you then, and formerly, that we differ concerning Election, Redemption, Mans will, and concerning falling away from grace: Now if it please you, you shall have your choice whether of these we shall discourse of, and so I shall lay down my position, and give you the grounds of it.

*M. Goodwin.* First you have no ground from what you heard from me to conceive that my judgement was concerning falling away.

*M. Iels.* Your desire the last day, *M. Powell*, was to discourse concerning Election and Redemption, and the variety and multiplicity of Questions will but confound you.

*M. Powell.* This was that which *M. Goodwin* laid down, That Christ died intentionally on Gods part, and on his own part to save all the posterity of Adam.

*M. Goodwin.* Though for your satisfaction I gave you an account of my opinion, yet I desire that you would state yours in opposition to mine.

*M. Powell.* I offered then to prove, first, that Iesus Christ did not die alike for every man: Secondly, that he did not die to redeem every man from the guilt of his sin, and from the curse of the Law.

*M. Goodwin.* If you will argue against my Doctrine, you must state your opinion contradictory to mine.

*M. Powell.* I will lie upon you in the first place to prove your proposition, and then upon me to prove the contrary.

*M. Goodwin.* If you please then, though the nature of the dispute doth not call upon me for it, yet I will give you a brief account of my opinion what it is, and in what sense I hold it,  
and



and then shall prove it from the Scripture; and so that two do not speak at once, I care not though twenty speak to it.

M. *Powell*. I desire only to speak three things in three words, because I hope they will tend to the glory of God. First, that if any of us shall break out into passion, we may be told of it, and kept from it. Secondly, if any one hath any thing to speak unto the point, after both of us have spoken, that they may do it orderly. Thirdly, that we may now agree whether to argue in a syllogisticall way or otherwise; the Propositions being laid down to bring Scriptures to prove them.

M. *Goodwin*. If you will reason from the Scriptures, and argue from them, I am willing.

M. *Powell*. It is necessary that we explain the termes in the Proposition.

M. *Goodwin*. This then is my judgment and doctrine touching the point of Gods intention in the death of Christ, or in the matter of redemption and salvation; I lay it down thus:

*That God did intend, or the intention of God in the death of Christ was, that all Adams posterity should be saved and redeemed.*

This doctrine I thus explain, and this is my sense in it. When I affirm, that the intention of God was that all *Adams* posterity should be saved, I attribute intentions to God only in such a sense as he is capable of intending any thing, or wherein they are appropriable or attributable to him, which sense is this; Supposing God to be a most pure, simple, undivided and indivisible Essence in himself, not capable of any multiplicity, or plurality of actions, but remaining unchangeable every way, he doth not intend things after the manner of creatures; the difference I explain thus: A man when he intends any thing, the act of his mind by which his intention is produced, it is essentially distinct from his essence and being, and from the nature of his soul, so that his soul is one thing, and his intention another; but now in attributing intentions to God, I do not conceive that his intention is one thing, and God himself another; but he is said to intend things, because he puts forth himself by means of that infinite perfection of his being after such a manner, for the bringing to passe of such and such effects, as men do when they intend any thing. For example; When a man intends any thing, this

is



is his course, he projects meanes, or sets afoot and ingageth himself in such or such a way for the effecting of what he intends, which is apt and proper to effect it: And in this sense I affirm, that God intends the salvation of all, because he affords & exhibits meanes proper for the salvation of all by the death of Christ.

And therefore, by the way, it will not follow, that in case the salvation of all men be not actually effected, that therefore God failes and miscarries in his intention; and the reason is, because what ever is attributed to God which is borrowed from men, as wisdom, love, hatred, and a thousand such things, they are onely attributed to him by way of effect, and not by way of affect, or of any formall existence or being in God; for there is no such thing as love, or hatred, or wisdom in him, to speak properly; but God by means of his pure and simple Essence, he is these, and all these, eminently and transcendently; but none of them formally, that is, in such a propriety of their severall natures, as wherein they are found in men and in Angels too; they are not in the divine nature upon any such account as they are in men: So that when we say God intends the salvation of all men, we suppose that God doth that, or behaves himself upon such terms, and in such a way as men do when they intend any thing: Yet not so, that God doth all things, or every thing that men do under their intentions; it is sufficient (according to the common notion of all Divines) that similitudes are good and serviceable to their end, if they hold in any one particular, though they fal short and vary in a thousand others. As for example; If God doth any one thing by means of the death of Christ, which men are wont to do ordinarily upon their intentions, then I suppose the doctrine is true, and will stand good, *That God did intend the salvation of all.* And therefore as men; when they intend many things, they do not alwayes intend them upon the highest, and most absolute termes, but they may really and truly be said to intend them, if they can be obtained by such and such means: As for example; To purchase a house, a man may intend it, if he can have it upon reasonable termes, and such as become a prudent man to give for it; but it doth not follow, that therefore he will give out of reason for it, or such a price that shall declare him to be a fool, or a man inconsiderate in his way. And so God intends

tends the salvation of all by the death of Christ, so far as to give means unto all, which are equitable and agreeable to his wisdom, for their salvation: not that he doth intend by way of decree; for, the decrees of God, if we take the word strictly, they are absolute and unchangeable, and he will ingage his mighty power to effect them; as, the resurrection of the dead, and the glorification of all those who shall live and die in the faith of his Son, these are so decreed by God, that all the interposings of all creatures can never hinder the execution of them. But now those things which are properly intended by God, they are not intended so to be procured, as by the omnipotency of his arme, and the exerting and putting forth of his mighty power to the utmost, but by such means as are agreeable to his wisdom, and to that kinde of creature whose salvation is intended by him. And this is the cleare sense of my opinion touching the intention of God about the death of Christ.

M. Powe<sup>r</sup>. I shall take hold of nothing in this Discourse, but onely this one thing, *Whether did the Lord intend the salvation of all Adams Posteritie, conditionally or absolutely?*

M. Goodwin. You desired that I should first propound my opinion, and then argue it, and now it is propounded, you come with another demand quite different from it, which is just according to the old saying, *Plura potest interrogare asinus quam respondere Aristoteles*, A fool may ask more questions in an houre, then a wise man may answer in seven years.

M. Cranford. M. Goodwin hath answered this already, that he did not intend it absolutely, but conditionally.

M. Powell. If you please to draw up your whole mind into one Argument, for no man is able to answer you in this long discourse.

M. Goodwin. It was not propounded for any such end, that you should answer it; for I have onely asserted, I have not proved any thing. But I will answer your Question,

*Whether God intends the salvation of all men absolutely or conditionally?*

This then I say, that in a sense, and true stating of all the



the decrees and counsells of God, I hold that they are all absolute, and independent upon any thing in the creature, that is, that God should intend the salvation of all men, in such a sense as I have declared; this purpose and intention of his was not occasioned or brought into him by any interposall, or consideration from the creature, but it was merely drawne out of his own will, and proceeded from his own grace and blessed intent; in this sense all the intentions of God are absolute. But now if by absolute you mean; that God will fulfill and put in execution the thing intended without any condition, so I say, they are not absolute but conditionall; for God doth not intend the salvation of any man, but only by the interposall of his faith and believing. Now if you please to let me go on, I shall produce my argument, and if it doth not reach home to my opinion, as I have laid it down, take notice of the defect, and we will eeke it out.

M. Powell. I onely desire this, because it is necessary that you first lay down what you assert, and go to prove.

M. Goodwin. That God hath intended the salvation of all men. And we shall first begin with that known Scripture, *Joh. 3. 16.* For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. From hence I argue thus: If so be that love out of which God gave his Son, was uniform unto the world, that is, unto all men, then God did intend (in the death of his Son) the salvation of all men, and we might add, with uniformity of intention, but I shall not need: But here the Evangelist expressly affirms, that God gave his Son out of that love which he bare unto the world, that is, unto all men, and that for this end that upon their believing they might be saved: therefore he did intend in the gift of his Son, the salvation of all men.

M. Powell. Your argument depends upon the word, [*world*] supposing it to be taken in a uniform sense.

M. Lordell. If it please you, Sir, deny one of the Propositions.

M. Powell. I deny your minor, if by the world you mean all Adams posterity.

M. Goodwin. Very well, I prove it thus: Either by the world here must be meant all Adams posterity, or particularly those whom



whom you call in your language, the elect of God; but by the world are not meant only the Elect of God in your sense, and therefore by the world is meant all mankind without exception.

M. Powell. I may deny both your Propositions.

M. Goodwin. Repeat them, and then deny them.

M. Powell repeated the Argument, and answered thus: First, your major proposition; the world is taken in Scripture not only for all the world, that is, every particular man, and for all the Elect, but severall other wayes: But I come to your minor, and say, that by the world in this place is meant the Elect of God.

M. Goodwin. If by the world is meant the Elect of God only, then the sense of the place must run thus; *So God loved the Elect of God, that whosoever of these Elect of God should believe, they should not perish, but, &c.* Which clearly implies, that some of the Elect of God will not believe, and so consequently may perish; but this is to put a non-sense upon the place, and to destroy the favor that is in it; and therefore cannot be the sense of it, as taken in this argument, that which destroyeth the construction of the sentence, and the favor which is in it, (which alone is fit to feed the understanding of a man) that cannot be the sense of the place, but now to understand the word [world] in this place of the Elect only, it makes the sense altogether unprofitable and senselesse: Ergo,

M. Powell. To this Argument I answer, that this may be the sense of the word [world] and the words may as well be read thus: *So God loved his Elect, that he gave, &c.* that such and such may be saved, that is, that they for whom he gave Jesus Christ, might believe, and so be saved; for the Lord did not onely love them, but he intended to bring them to believe, and so the extent of his love and of believing, they are as large the one as the other, God so loved the Elect, that he would give them faith and save them.

M. Goodwin. I do not understand your answer, but either you mean by the [world] the Elect only, or else more then the Elect, or all mankind in generall; but say I, neither of the former senses can be meant, neither the Elect only, nor some others be-

sides the Elect, but onely the whole posterity of *Adam*.

*M. Powell.* I say by the word [world] in this place is meant the Elect only, because the Evangelist saith, *God [so] loved the world*, he puts a [so] upon it: Now you never find that God in Scripture is said to love all the posterity of *Adam* with such a love, which is here called a loving of them [so] and which is called (in *Eph. 2.*) a great love.

*M. Goodwin.* The Scripture holds forth a twofold love of God: First, a generall love which is attributed to him in respect of all his creatures, and secondly, a more particular and speciall love, that is, to those who have behaved themselves according to his Will and Word, by believing in his Son, and so by faith and holinesse continue to the end: And whereas you conceive that this particle [so] here in the Text, is only augmentative, that it only declares the greatnesse of the love of God; this I absolutely deny; for together with the greatnesse of this love it doth modifie and restrain it, and reduce it to this forme and tenor of love: it is not said simply, so God loved the world, that he gave his Son, that all the world should be saved; then indeed it had been only augmentative; but mark the condition which comes in, upon which God loved the world, and intends to save it, *viz.* that whosoever believeth shall be saved: Which shewes that this particle [so] is not onely intensive; and doth not only stand there to declare the greatnesse and transcendency of the love of God to the world, but the tenor and the limitation of it, how and upon what termes God loved the world, *viz.* that he gave his Son Jesus Christ so and upon such termes only, that whosoever *believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life.

*M. Powell.* You affirm these two things, that there is a generall and a speciall love in God, and when you speak of the generall, you speak of it as extending to all the creatures: But secondly, when you speak of a speciall love, you seem to say that it is not a speciall love which this word [so] holds out: but I say, this is a speciall love, my reason is this, because the Apostle when he speaketh of this very love (in the 5. of the *Rom.*) he saith, that God commendeth his love towards us, that whilst we were yet sinners Christ died for us. This Scripture explains the



the other, and this must of necessity be speciall love.

*M. Goodwin.* If by speciall you mean great and wonderfull, and so forth, so I grant it is a speciall love; but if you meane such a love or affection in God, which is exprest or born by him towards those that do actually believe, so that place in the *Romans* doth not hold forth or speak of any such love; for the love of God is generall, and he commends it exceedingly and marvellously herein, but yet it was a love so limited and qualified by God, that no persons should partake of the fruit of it, but those that should believe. And further, this condition which God puts upon the partaking of the fruit of his love, doth not represent his love the lesse commendable, or lesse worthy of him, God doth not shew himself lesse loving hereby, but onely declares himself herein to be a God as well of wisdom, as of love; and it is his wisdom that doth moderate and steer all his Attributes in all their issuings and goings forth unto the world: Now it had not been a love worthy of God so infinite in wisdom and goodnesse towards those whom ye call the Elect, that they should partake of the benefit of this love, but in, and by, and upon their believing.

*M. Powell.* From this I gather two things: First, that the speciall love of God is towards men that are believers, and that upon condition of believing: And secondly, you say, that that is the meaning of the Apostle in the *Romans*.

*M. Goodwin.* No, that I do not, but the contrary, and that it is the same with that which is here spoken of; for it's said, *that whilst we were yet sinners, God sent his Son to die for us*, and I say that the intention of God in this love of his, and in the immediate expression of it in the gift of his Son, it was that men should not partake of the compleat fruit and benefit of it but upon the terms and condition of believing.

*M. Powell.* Let us keep to this, either the love of God is a speciall or common love, if it was a speciall love, then it is a love to all, or unto some; if to all, then you must prove it, if to some, then it must be tied to the Elect of God.

*M. Goodwin.* I gave you clearly my sense before, that there is an ambiguity in the word speciall, if by that you mean great, wonderfull, and admirable, so as to affect the heart, and to ra-

vish



with the souls of men, so both this and that in the *Romans* are the speciall love of God; but if you mean by it such a love, or such expressions of love from God which are peculiar and appropriate only to believers, so I say the love of God is not meant, neither in this place nor in that.

M. Powell. I conceive that in both these places he meanes a speciall love in the latter sense; for the Evangelist and the Apostle do intend this speciall love to the Elect, and my reason is this, because God in the Scriptures holds forth no speciall love at all, but unto such persons.

M. Goodwin. You deny the conclusion, for my conclusion is, that it holds forth a speciall love.

M. Caryll. That is not at all in the *Question*, whether the love of God be speciall as a great love, or a small love, but whether speciall be opposed to generall.

M. Goodwin. If by speciall he means such a love which is expressed or born by God towards those who are actuall believers, then I say, it is not speciall.

M. Powell. When I speak of speciall love, I mean not speciall so as belonging to actuall believers onely, but unto those who believe as well *de futuro*, as *de presenti*.

M. Goodwin. The Scripture doth not take knowledge, or hold forth any speciall love in your sense to any but only unto those that are actuall believers: As for all others, whom you term the *elect of God*, before their faith, the Scripture still wraps them up in the same generall term of *the world*. *The whole world lieth in wickednesse*, saith *John*. Now in this word *world*, certainly there were more elect in your sense that did afterwards believe, then at the present, els all the labour and preaching of the Apostles had been in vain: And therefore for the elect who do not actually believe, they are no where presented in the Scripture as under part or fellowship of the speciall love of God, which is appropriate to believers, but they are bound up in the common bundle of the world, and they are enemies to God, and God an enemy to them, in such a sense as to wicked men.

M. Powell. Give me leave to answer unto this. You say, that if we mean a speciall love, that is, such a love as God bears unto believers, that then there is no such love in God but unto actuall believers.

believers. Now I deny this, and affirm that there is the same love in God towards others that are elect, who are not believers, as there is to those who actually believe: And this I prove from two Scriptures, *Jer. 31. 31. I have loved thee with an everlasting love*, and *Rom. 9. 11. Jacob have I loved, &c.* and now from hence I will argue thus, That love which these two texts hold forth, it is a speciall love, and it is towards persons that were not actual believers.

M. Cranford. M. Goodwin's argument formerly was to this effect, That the love of God was the motive to the giving of Christ, is extended unto the world, and therefore the giving of Christ must likewise concern the world. M. Powell's Answer was, that by the world is meant onely the elect: this was took away thus, that such a construction of the word would take away the savor and sense of the Scripture. Now M. Powell should have given an answer to this, and proved that the love of God in that place is meant of a speciall love. Now I desire you to have respect to this word world, where your Argument chiefly consists, and prove that the word world in a narrower sense then the whole world takes away the savor of the words.

M. Caryll. M. Goodwin seems to conclude against any interpretation but onely that of a universall, because if it be taken in any narrower you spoile the sense.

M. Drake. Let that be proved that it mays the sense.

M. Goodwin. I beseech you consider the words, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever, &c.* Now if by the [world] you will understand the Elect, then the sense must run thus, God so loved the Elect, that whosoever of these Elect should believe, should not perish, &c. For this word [whosoever] is a distributive word, it must distribute some, either the Elect or all men; therefore the meaning must needs be, that God so loved the world, that whosoever they be, whether Elect or not Elect, that shall believe, they shall be saved: And if you look your best Expositors, many of them do interpret the word [world] as I do, universally; *Muscus* and others.

M. Powell. When M. Goodwin urged his Argument, I denied the major and minor Proposition, that the world was not taken in that sense onely.

M. Goodwin.



M. Goodwin. Why who then doth he mean by *whosoever*? for that must needs relate to the persons of men, and if to men, then to some men, or to all men, if you will not understand it so, you make an absolute nonsense of it, and put a Pronoun without an Adjective: Therefore this word [*whosoever*] must distribute either the Elect, or all men, or else some middle sort of men between both.

M. Drake. *I desire you to bring an Argument to prove it nonsense, if by the world be meant the Elect.*

M. Goodwin. Mind the words again, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that [whosoever] believeth in him, &c.* That which I am to prove is, that (to make sense of the place) the word *whosoever* must distribute some men, either the Elect or all men, or some other number of men between both. If you deny that, it must be distributive, then find a Substantive to the Adjective, who doth God meane when he saith *whosoever*? doth he not mean what man soever?

M. Powell. I think *whosoever* and *world*, are of the same signification and extent, and I suppose by the world there is meant those that should believe, and not the world taken as it is oft in Scripture for all men: I have given my reason why it cannot be understood but in the former sense for the Elect.

M. Cranford. *Answer punctually to M. Goodwins Argument, which is, that the word whosoever is a distributive word, dividing the subject spoken of into two parts, and therefore the word world must not be understood of the Elect, except you say whosoever of the Elect believeth shall be saved, and whosoever of them believeth not shall perish.*

M. Goodwin. If you will precisely urge the sense of the participle which is the present tense, then it will be thus, *whoever doth now at the present believe he shall not perish, and consequently ye exclude all other.*

Answer, No.

M. Goodwin. Then do not stick to the precise tense, but *whosoever* doth or shall at any time believe, and supposing this to be your sense, yet the same absurdity will follow, if ye admit any other sense of the word *world*, but only the generality of mankind.

M. Powell.

*M. Powell.* For my part I have spoken what is my judgement and conscience in the thing, that the words may be rendered thus, without destroying the sense of them, *God so loved the world, &c.* that whosoever believeth or shall believe: Now *whoever*, that word may have relation to the world, that is, unto the elect world, it may distribute it unto them, and not destroy the sense.

*M. Goodw.* Do but see now and view it your self, whether this be a commodious sense worthy to fasten upon the Holy Ghost, to speak at such a rate; God so loved the world of the elect, that whosoever of the elect should believe, should not perish, but &c. and whether this interpretation doth not clearly suppose that there is a possibility that some of these elect may perish? wherefore els doth he interpose that clause, that *whosoever believeth shall not perish*? For, taking your notion of election, there election gives them a perfect and absolute right to salvation; insomuch that there needs neither dying on Christs part, nor believing on their part, to give them a right thereunto. If they were elected from eternity, what greater or fuller title can there be to any creature, or right to such a possession or inheritance as salvation is, then the peremptory and absolute designation of God thereunto? Salvation is Gods, to give to whom he please, and if he do it to any persons simply and absolutely, as they are his Elect they should be saved, whether they believed or no, I only add this to shew the nonsense of such a construction of the words.

*M. Powell.* To make it appear, that it is not nonsense, I illustrate it thus: The *Parliament of England*, suppose they make such a promise to the Army, or unto others, that whoever takes the Ingagement they shall be protected by their power, and so taking of it they come under their protection; but now will you say that of necessity it must be supposed here, that some will deny to take this ingagement.

*M. Good.* I go along with your similitude so far, that God makes a Proposition as the Parliament to the Army & others, that is, to all the world, that whosoever takes the ingagement, that is believeth, they shall be protected, *i.e.* they shall be saved: this now is savory, & hath substance in it, it feeds the understanding of a man: But now if the Parliament had such a power over the wills of



some particular men, as to cause them to take this Ingagement, and know certainly that no others would take it, then to make such a proposall to them, that whosoever will take it they shall be protected, this would not be a Proposition worthy of them.

M. Cranford. *The point which you are to prove, is, That there is an absurdity in this sense, to say, that God so loved the elect, that all the elect believing shall be saved; the ground which you give of this absurdity is this, because according to the judgement of M. Powell, the decree of Election is such, that there is no need of the death of Christ, nor believing, to bring them to salvation.*

M. Goodwin. *That was a thing which I added by the way, but to passe that, God hath made such a decree, that none (though elect) should be saved, but in and through believing; he hath linked together Faith and Election.*

M. John Simpfon. *I shall desire (M. Powell being now to answer) that he would not speak so largely as he doth, but only deny M. Goodwins Proposition, and put him to prove it; for the thing is yet to prove, that there is nonsense in that saying, and it's that which I suppose will not be proved these seven years.*

M. Goodwin. *If I have no sense, nor taste of nonsense, possibly you may, if not, I cannot relieve you, nor you me as yet, and therefore let us read the words again, So God loved the world, that, &c. that all believing in him should not perish, but, &c. Now to make the words run thus, or to give this sense of them, so God loved his Elect, that every one of these Elect who shall believe, or believing they shall not perish, this (I say) is complicit nonsense, neither can you bring any instance out of the Scripture, nor from any approved Author, that was but in his common senses, that did ever build such a piece of construction as this is.*

M. Caryll. *I doubt not but there will be a very good sense in it, to say thus, that God so loved the world, (that is, the elect) that whosoever believeth, or that all believing, should not perish, but, &c. it is but the carrying on of the same thing from one act unto another, from the act of God unto the act of man; the act of God is his love, and the giving of Jesus Christ for the redemption of his elect; now because these shall never attain the end, they shall never reach to that redemption.*

redemption which was intended for them without believing, therefore Christ puts in that, so that you must carry it on as to the completing of the person who shall inherit that estate.

M. Goodwin. Then you deny it to be a distributive particle.

M. Caryll. It is a collective, and not a distributive, it is not.

M. Cranford. This doth not only shew the love of God, but the limitation of his love: Now I take it, it may be sense in that sense which you gave of it, God shewes his love to his elect in appointing them the means of their salvation, God modifies that love in bringing them to salvation through believing, he so loveth his elect, that all they by believing shall be saved.

M. Goodwin. The question is, whether such a sense be savory, and whether it will stand with the words; I say, it is evident from the following words that it cannot be the sense.

M. Powell. If it please you, you have spoken what you think good in this particular, and these have heard what hath been said, and therefore let us refer it to them, and passe to another.

Mr. Goodwin. There is a great deal more yet to be said to it; for either it is a distributive, or else it hath no manner of Substantive or person that is implied in it, for I would faine know what it signifieth, or what you mean by it, it's impossible for me to prove that twice two make four: so God loved the world, that the whole world believing should be saved; bring me such an example from Scripture, or from any approved Author, wherein the subject distributed was necessarily to partake of the benefit assigned to him by such a distribution.

M. Cranford. Prove that it doth distribute.

M. Goodwin. Either it doth distribute, or else you must grant that there is no Substantive to the Adjective.

M. Cranford. Was it not a great mercy, that the Covenant was altered from a Covenant of Works, to a Covenant of Grace?

M. Goodwin. No, not in your sense of the Covenant of Grace, but the hardest measure that could be to the children of men.



M. Simpson. *It concerns you to require of M. Goodwin to prove by a Syllogisme, that your interpretation is non-sense, otherwise you have done nothing but talked all this while.*

M. Powell. I suppose he hath spoken in plain termes as much as he can put into a Syllogisme.

M. Goodwin. Then take it thus, if by the world be meant the Elect, then there is a possibility that some of the Elect may perish; but there is no possibility that any of the Elect should perish; and therefore by the word world is not meant the Elect.

M. Powell. I deny your consequence.

M. Goodwin. Either such a consequence must follow that some of the Elect may perish, or else this clause that *whosoever believes shall not perish*, is impertinent, and beares no manner of weight nor importance in it; if there be an absolute necessity that the Elect should believe, and be saved, then there is a superfluity of this clause, *whosoever believeth [shall not perish.]* If God I say, shall be supposed to have so loved the Elect, or any certain number of men, that he is resolved upon the account of this election of his that none of them shall perish, then it will be found a meer impertinency or nonsense to put in such an exception or proviso as this, that in case they believe they shall not perish; for that I suppose is clearly included in this, when he saith, *whosoever believeth shall be saved*, he intimates that *whosoever doth not believe shall perish*, and so it followes, that some of the Elect may perish.

M. Powell. I deny the consequence of your major Proposition.

M. Goodwin. If no other sense nor import can be found out for these words *[shall not perish]* but only upon a supposition, that some may perish, then your interpretation of the word world for the Elect cannot stand, for it makes nonsense of the place, because it supposeth that some of the elect may perish, but in your sense it is impossible that any of them should perish, therefore that cannot be the sense and meaning of the words.

M. Menning. M. Goodwin cannot prove his Argument; There

is eternall life promised to them that are elected; and believing is promised as well as eternall life; therefore there is no implication that some of the elect should not believe, and so may perish.

M. Goodwin. What, is believing here promised, as clearly as eternall life upon believing? it's cleare beside the truth.

M. Venning. M. Goodwin cannot prove it, therefore hold him to it.

M. Goodwin. Observe the words, God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Sonne, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Now if there were a necessity that all those that are elected (meant by the world here, as you say) should be saved, and that there is no possibility that any of them should perish, then this clause [should not perish] is impertinent; and the mind of Christ would be every whit as complete and absolute, if those words were left out, namely if the sentence were read thus, God so loved the elect, that whosoever of them should believe should be saved; and so that clause [should not perish] would be a meer absurdity.

M. Cranford. M. Goodwin saith, That if by the world be meant the elect, then that clause [of not perishing] should be in vain; the reason is, because the whole may as well be comprehended in these words, They shall have eternall life.

M. Powell. If it please you M. Goodwin, I conceive that such a consequence cannot be deducted from the text, that because the Lord addeth, Whosoever believeth shall be saved, that therefore there is a possibility that some of them may perish: Doth not the Apostle when he speaks of assurance; urge men to give all diligence to make their calling and election sure? doth the exhortation hold forth any such thing, that therefore it's possible for them to fall because he thus exhorts them?

M. Goodwin. I beseech you shew me what import, or sense more there is in that clause [should not perish] then there would be in case it were wholly omitted and left out: Or whether in saying, God so loved the elect, that every of them believing should have eternall life; whether, I say, there be not as much in that clause, as there is now this is put in.

M. Cran. We may consider the redemption wrought by Iesus Christ as completed



completed in two things: in delivering us from the wrath and curse, and in restoring of us to that life and grace from which we are fallen: so he saith that every believer shall be delivered from wrath, and shall have a re-possession and right again unto that life and salvation from whence he is fallen.

*M. Goodwin.* But the Question is, whether there be not non-perishing included as well in those words [shall have everlasting life] as if the other words [shall not perish] were put in.

*M. Caryll.* We may look upon it as confirmative, that God should express it both in the negative and affirmative.

*M. Goodwin.* If there be a sense wherein we may find more of the wisdom of God; it is not for us to strike it out, neither is there any reason that we should make God speak Tautologies, when there is a fair sense of the words to be found out.

*M. Drak.* God might but have made this promise, that whosoever believes shall not perish, and this had been great mercy and infinite love, but to add that he shall have everlasting life, this is ex abundanti, he might have delivered men from hell, and not have brought them to heaven.

*M. Goodwin.* But is it possible for God to preserve a creature from perishing, and not to give him everlasting life? Not perishing doth include in it preservation in life and being.

*M. Patrick.* Let us not think, because the Holy Ghost is pleased to use severall expressions to strengthen our faith in a thing, that therefore it is needlesse to be added.

*M. Goodwin.* I do not say it is needlesse to be added, it is you that make it needlesse: And for any man to say that the Holy Ghost speaks tautologies, when we can find heavenly matter in the words, this is contrary to the duty of an interpreter.

*M. Cranf.* You have spent much time in this thing: *M. Goodwin* saith, that if by the world be meant the elect, then either it is possible that some of the elect may perish, or else there is no weight or import to be found in these words [shall not perish] more then is in these other [shall have everlasting life.] *M. Powell* saith there is a gradation, the shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life. I conceive there are other Arguments, which possibly may be more to the purpose, therefore if you please leave this, and passe to another.

*M. Powell.*

*M. Powell.* If you please let us leave this to the Lord, and go on to some other Scripture.

*M. Goodwin.* Then go to the next Verse.

*M. Caryll.* *M. Goodwin* I only desire that one thing, whilst you say the word [whosoever] must needs be a distributor, that you would consider the two Verses before, whether it be a distributive there or no, v. 14. & 19. And as Moses lifted up the Serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that (whosoever) believeth in him should not perish, but have eternall life: Where is the distribution here?

*M. Goodwin.* Why mankind; for it is clear, and I refer it to you, whether there be any other sense of the word (whosoever) but whosoever of all mankind.

*M. Caryll.* You made the distribution before of the world, and here before he speaks any thing of a generality, having said, the Son of Man was lifted up not for these, or these, or for mankind in generall, he comes in with these words, that (whosoever) believeth in him should not perish.

*M. Goodwin.* Very well, then the thing is clear, and I refer it to you, whether you think that there is any other sense can be made of it, then all mankind, even all the posterity of Adam: Nay, *M. Powell* holds that Christ did die for all men, upon such termes, that whosoever believeth should not perish.

*M. Caryll.* I say the words are a generall assertion, and not a distribution.

*M. Goodwin.* By a distribution I mean nothing else but the severing of a multitude, or generalls, into particulars.

*M. Caryll.* Taking the word world for the elect, we deny that (whosoever) is a distribution, but only a generall assertion, that all that believe shall be saved.

*M. Goodwin.* Then is this the sense of the place, that whosoever of the elect believeth shall be saved?

*M. Caryll.* We need not bring the words into such a generall interpretation.

*M. Goodwin.* But this is that which I would know, Whether there be any difference between these two, to say that all the elect shall be saved, and to say, that every one of the elect shall be saved.

*M. Caryll.*



M. Caryll. No.

M. Goodwin. Then it is a distribution.

M. Caryll. *If it be a distribution, it is within the same limits, and doth not distribute divers kinds.*

M. Goodwin. If so be it be here supposed, that there be some whom God so loved as to give his Son for, who possibly may perish, then by the word world is not meant the elect; but here is a clear supposition, that there are some of those whom God so loved, that he gave his Son for, that may perish; and therefore by the word world is not meant the elect.

M. Powell. I deny the sequell of your major Proposition:

M. Goodwin. Mind how the words run, *God so loved the world, that whosoever, &c.* Now if you will not suppose that some of them for whom God gave his Son may perish, then you must suppose that these must be saved, whether they believe or no; and so make this the sense, that God so loved the world, that he gave his Son, that all the Elect (whether believing, or not believing) should not perish, but have everlasting life.

M. Simpson. *I desire that when M. Powell denies a sequell, that M. Goodwin be very carefull to prove it.*

M. Goodwin. To deny the sense of the word world to be the generality of men, it renders the carriage of the place altogether nonsense, as hath been shewed already by severall arguments: And if you will, we will add another from the following verse, *v. 15; God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved:* (This is not an Argument I confesse, of such absolute demonstration, but of marvelous great probability that the word world is taken and meant in the same sense in both the clauses.) Now if this cannot be the sense of it, that God sent his Son into the world to condemn the elect, then by the word world in the former verse is not meant the elect.

M. Powell. Your Argument I conceive, is not to the businesse, which I deny.

M. Cranford. *Your first thing is to prove the sequell of your former Argument, and now you are gone off to another.*

M. Goodwin.

*M. Goodwin.* You have been continually pressing upon me to wave my former Argument, and to go to another; and yet now I have done so, you are not contented. My intent or desire in going off from it, was not because I think there was any thing answered to it, but because in variety of Arguments one may not be so concluding as another, nor have such influence upon the people.

*M. Simpson.* *M. Powell denies the sequell, and you have not proved it, and all your Arguments have been answered.*

*M. Goodwin.* If you will call any thing that is said to what I have spoken an answer, then you have answered my Argument, but an Argument is then said to be answered, when it is denied upon a rationall ground.

*M. Powell.* You might have desired a reason of my deniall, and had you asked it, I would have given it.

*M. Goodwin.* You did so, such as it was.

*M. Cranford.* *M. Goodwin's sequell was this, That if by the world be meant the elect, then in these words should not perish, it must bee supposed that some of the elect may perish, which is impossible; and therefore by the word world is not meant the elect.*

*M. Goodwin.* The reason which I gave was the very words themselves, that else there will bee no import or weight of moment in this clause [ *should not perish* ] because as much as is contained herein will bee found in that clause [ *shall have everlasting life* ] if everlasting life imply non-perishing, and non-perishing imply everlasting life, then there is as much in that as in the other, and so the other clause will bee found impertinent and superfluous, it being included with advantage in this clause, *shall have everlasting life.*

*M. Powell.* Give mee leave to speake one word; I suppose, and appeale to this whole Congregation, whether there bee not many words in Christ's owne speaking, that are answerable to these, as to exhort men not to fall from grace, and the like, and yet there is no danger in the thing.

*M. Goodwin.* I am not of your mind.

E

M. Simpson.



M. Simpson. *This is not to the purpose, but it concernes you to look to the Proposition, and to see that that be proved.*

M. Cranford. *This is a question of greater consequence then possibly is imagined, upon the right determination whereof depends the whole glory of the grace of God, and the whole comfort and salvation of mankind, the whole glory of the grace of God depends upon it; for if so be there be such an universall redemption of every particular man in the world, and upon those terms that it's hung open in the ayre, catch that catch will, and none was more in the eye of God then other in the death of his Sonne, truly instead of maintaining universall grace, you maintain no grace at all.*

M. Goodwin. *One discourse in this kind will but beget another, but I shall prove (God willing) both to your self and others, that your sense and opinion in restraining the death of Christ for such and such particular persons, doth wholly dissolve and eclipse the grace of God; and that there is no other way to see it forth like unto it self, or worthy of God, but only according to such an assertion, that God did intend the salvation of all by the death of Christ; and that the comfort of all men, and every particular man doth depend upon it; and if men will but reason like men, or according to the Scriptures, it's impossible that there should be any ground of consolation upon any other accompt.*

M. Simpson. *We have been long about this, something I conceive hath been spoken for edification, but if M. Goodwin will oppose or answer, we will still provide those that shall oppose or answer him: onely this I desire, that this order may be observed for the future, that the Moderator who shall be pitcht upon may not speak any thing to discover his own judgment, onely to keep them to the Question, and to see the Propositions proved, that are denied. And secondly, I desire that no man may be suffered to speak a word, but he that doth oppose, and he that doth answer: and if these rules be observed, some good may come of it.*

M. Goodwin. *I think there should be a second allowed on both sides.*

M. Powell. *I shall make bold to speak one word, for my part I blesse God that our meeting hath been as it hath, that there hath*

hath been no more contention, or division amongst us; and I refer what hath been controverted to the Congregation, and desire them to judge of it: And if M. Goodwin will ingage further at another time, there will be some to oppose him.

M. Simpson. *I will never undertake to dispute, unlesse every man shall be commanded silence but the two Disputants and the Moderator, to keep us to the Question. And M. Goodwin, having at this time pressed his Arguments; if now he will answer to the Question, there shall be some ready still to oppose.* ✓

M. Goodwin. Though I conceive the lawes of Dispute in this kind will somewhat suffer, by the observation of those rules, yet if the truth will not be entertained, nor the Dispute carried on, but upon that motion, I shall stand to it.





THE SECOND  
DISPUTATION

BETWIXT  
Mr. *John Goodwin*, and Mr. *John Simpson*,  
at Allhallowes the Great in Thames-street  
London, January 14. 1649.

M. *Ames*, } Moderators.  
M. *Griffeth*, }

After the orderly disposal of themselves for the best advantage to the Hearers, Mr. *Goodwin* in the Gallery, and Mr. *Simpson* in the Pulpit, it began thus.

M. *Simpson*.

**S**IR, if you please, I shall speak only one word to the people in-reference to our present meeting, and then we will choose a Moderator, and desire him to speak a word for us to the Lord. I have only one short word to say, which is, to informe you, that the businesse about which we are met at this time, it is (as I conceive) an Ordinance of God,

God, we read in the 9. of the *Acts*, that *Paul* disputed with the Grecians, and in the 17. of the *Acts*, that he disputed with the Jewes, Grecians and Philosophers; and in the 19. of the *Acts*, that he disputed daily in the School of one *Tyrannus*: and therefore my humble request unto you is, that ye would behave and demean yourselves so, as people that stand in the presence of God, and do apprehend that we have an Ordinance of God in hand.

I know there are some weak Objections which some bring against what I now say, as first, that of the Apostle, *Phil. 2.* where he commands that all things be done without disputings, and that in the 1. of *Tim. 6.* where he speaks against perverse disputings: But the answer is easie, that he doth not speak in either of these places against his own practise, but against those Disputations which proceed from perversnesse and corruption in the hearts of men.

Another thing that some will object is this, that the weak are not to be admitted to doubtfull Disputations, and therefore not to such a conference or dispute as this is: To which I answer, That when the Apostle speaks against the admitting of weak Christians to doubtfull Disputations, hee speaks of those Disputations which concerne not things fundamentall: But the point which we are upon is of great concernment, a fundamentall point in Religion, the ground of Faith, what it is that every man and woman must believe, that they may be saved: As, whether they are to believe that Christ died with an intention to save all the Posterity of *Adam*; or, whether he died to save sinners indefinitely, that *whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but &c.* and therefore I conceive that Objection will not at all prejudice our practise at this time.

A third Objection is this, That there are such incivilities usually amongst the people at such conferences, that it were a great deale better to let them alone, then for godly men to ingage in them. To this I answer: That this is the fault of the people, and not of the duty; and I hope, your ingenuity will be such at this time,



time, and your Christianity, that ye will be able by your demeanure to confute this objection; I hope you will remember that ye are Christians the most of ye, and that ye ought in body and soul, to behave your selves in all things, to the glory of your heavenly Father.

The last objection that I have met withall, is this, that usually in such disputes men rather seek themselves then the glory of Jesus Christ, and vent their passion, and seek for mastery rather then for truth: But I hope there will be such a presence of the Spirit of Grace in the learned respondent, and my self, that by our deportment we shall be able to overthrow, and to detect the weaknesse of this objection; and therefore I desire ye with silence, and candor, to hear us whilst we seek not our selves, but the glory of God, in the exaltation of truth, in the name of the Lord Jesus.

*Mr. Goodwin.* I hope the people of God here gathered together, will give me also the patient hearing of a word or two, and so mete out the same measure unto me which they have done to you. Whereas *Mr. Simpson* was pleased to instance in severall places, wherein *Paul* the great Apostle disputed against the opposers of Christian Religion, (which he stood up indeed to maintain against the whole world) if you please, you may add to those instances another in the 6. *Acts* 9. where you shall find that certain of the synagogue called the sect of the Libertines and Cyrenians disputed against Stephen: So that ye see there were disputations as well managed against the Apostles, as by the Apostles; as well against *Paul*, as by *Paul*, against those that were enemies to Christianity; and that in the synagogues of the Jews.

As

As for that which Mr. *Simpson* was pleased to intimate, concerning the state of the question now in dispute, by which he doth distinguish it from those Questions or doubtfull Disputations, whereunto the weak Christians were not to be admitted; I suppose there is nothing spoken by *Paul* against their admission thereunto, but only this, that weak Christians were not to be intangled, or incomed, or denyed communion in Church-fellowship, upon points or questions that were doubtfull, and not clear but ambiguous, not but that the weakest of all are fit, and indeed more fit to be admitted to such Disputations which may tend to the increase of their faith and knowledge, then other men: But now whereas he chargeth so much weight upon the question now to be debated, through the assistance of God, and his presence with us, as that it is a fundamentall point of Religion, and that which is of absolute necessity to be believed by every man and woman unto salvation; I must confesse, though I verily believe, that I do place as much weight in it, and am as tender and jealous of the honor and glory of God (I may speak it upon this occasion, though I be a fool for my labour, as *Paul* sometimes said, though upon another occasion) as he can do in that point opposite to mine, which he stands up here to maintain; yet neverthelesse, I do not place any such weight or concernment in the question, but that whether men be of the one faith or of the other, whether they be of his judgment, or of mine in the point, they may be saved through the grace of God, which doth not stand in this, that men should take part evermore with the right hand in matters of such deep and profound



found consideration as this is; but solely and entirely in this, that they doe truly and sincerely believe in Jesus Christ for salvation. Now whether it be supposed, or held that Christ died for all men, or onely for a certaine number of men, such and such, and no other, this (I conceive) hath no influence at all, but is altogether irrelative to the faith of Christians, and that men may believe in Christ unto salvation, whether they believe the one or the other.

I desire onely to add this one thing further to the Congregation here present, I hope they are here met together without prejudice in their judgements, or at least with their Consciences unbyassed, (in a point (I confesse) of very great concernment, though not so great as hath been presented to them) and therefore I desire to speak these two things very briefly to them. First of all that for my self, as *Paul* saith, in another case, he was a long time a Pharisee, in the way of a Pharisee, and very strict he was, and did profit therein above many his equalls, but afterwards when Christ was revealed to him, those things which before were a treasure to him, which he highly esteemed, and thought himself in a happy condition because of them, afterwards he counted them but as drosse and dunt in comparison of the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ his Lord: So must I professe before you all this day (though in part it will redound (it may be) to some shame, and disparagement to my self) yet for the honour of him for whom I was created, and for whom if I should sacrifice all that I have, or am, I am fully resolved herein that I cannot be better bestowed, or disposed of, then in sacrificing upon the service of the Lord Jesus Christ, who hath been already sacrificed upon the service of my soul, as of yours.

Now

Now this is that which I would signifie unto you; that for my self, for many yeares together, even since I was first capable of understanding any thing in the Gospell, and Ministry of God, I was of that judgement whereof it seems Mr. *Symson* is at this day, and though I would not speak it of my self, yet I crave leave to acquaint you with what others have said in this behalf, that I spake more, and produced more Arguments and Reasons for the confirmation of that Opinion; more I say, then what generally others of my Brethren in the Ministry, or others of the same judgement with me then usually did; But since it pleased God to enlarge my understanding so far, as to go round about the Controversie, and to see, and ponder, and weigh, (with the greatest impartialness of Judgement, and Conscience, that I, with my weaknesse and infirmities (common to all) was capable of;) going I say round about, again and again, and telling the towers, and viewing the strength, the arguments, evidences, and mighty demonstrations of that Opinion and judgement wherein I now stand, I was not able, by all the help and assistance that I had from all my former thoughts, and discussions, wherein I had given out my self to the utmost of that light, and learning, and strength which God had given me, all these were of no value, or consideration at all unto me, to stand up against that further light which came in unto me on the other hand, yea though I was conscientiously, and deeply engaged in it; and this is one thing which I desired to impart unto you upon this occasion.

There is only one thing more, and then I have done: I know it is the sense of far the greatest part of you, (if not of the generality) that in matters of Faith, and Religion, and which concerne Salvation, (though but in such a degree, as the present question doth, at a distance) that yet there is nothing, or nothing considerable to be built upon any mans reason, or upon such Discourses, or Discussions, which are managed, or drawn from the Scriptures by the interceding, or mediation of reason, or humane understanding: which supposed, Let me say this unto you, that there is no man who holds, that *Christ Died for some particular persons, and not for all*, but his Faith in this point doth stand meerly, and purely upon the Discussion, Advice, and Work.



ings of the reasons of men; whereas that Opinion which I maintain, concerning the *Universality* of *Christ's Death* for all; this stands upon expresse Scriptures, plaine and clear words, and terms, without the intervention of any mans reason to carry it, or to make it out; and therefore in as much as there is no place in all the Scripture that doth affirme, that either *Christ Died for some particular persons only*; or that denies, that he *Died for all men*; but many that expressly and particularly in the latter affirme, *that he Died for all*: therefore cleare it is (at least thus far) that all those arguments which are brought from the Scriptures to prove the contrary, they must be founded, and built upon the Discussions, Reasons, and givings out of the reasons, and Apprehensions of men.

Mr. Symp. I crave leave to add one word in answer to what you have spoken: for the first thing I shall not speak much to it, but shall shew of what necessity this Point is, I hope, in the prosecution of our Discourse. But secondly, whereas you seeme to work upon the People by telling them that you were formerly of that Opinion, and Judgement, which I stand here to maintain, I shall only say this, and leave it with you, *That Master Goodwin is not the first Man that hath held forth the Truth of Jesus Christ, and afterwards departed from it*. But then, whereas you say, that *Christ Dying for all* is from expresse Scripture, and that the contrary must be infer'd only by reason, and argument, this is the businesse of our Dispute, and therefore you ought not without liberty to have spoken to it.

Mr. Goodwin. Sir, you impose a great necessity upon me. To returne a word or two unto you: you informe this People with as much disparagement and uningenuity, as likely can be in so many words, by telling them that *I was not the first Man that departed from the Faith of Jesus Christ to an heterodox Faith, and Opinion*: wherein you certainly triumph before the Battell, and cry victoria before you put on your harness; Positively concluding, that though *I was not the first*, yet I am in the number and retinue of those who have deserted the Christian Faith, and turned in unto error; and I hope I may as freely say this, that *as you are not the first*, so I hope you will not be the last, who shall dissent an Error, and Opinion, and ways that are

not freight, to turne into the wages of Life and Peace; I had rather professe my hope and Christian Belief concerning you here, in, then to censure, or determine any thing against you, as you your self have done against me; and for my part it is in vaine for me to dispute, if it be already concluded, and determined beforehand, that I am one of those.

Mr. Symp. I speak my apprehension in the Presence of God, I conceive that it is an error which you maintaine, that *Christ Died for all the posterity of Adam*; and that it is a Truth, that he died in a particular manner for some. And therefore according to my apprehension, I cannot but deale plainly, and ingenuously by you, to tell you, in the Presence of God, that if you did first hold this, and afterwards depart from it, that then you forsooke the truth, to embrace an error. But because replies will be infinitum, will you please Sir to pitch upon a Moderator, an indifferent Man, who may judge of our Syllogismes, and keep us to the question.

Mr. Goodwin. I suppose his interest, who ever he be, will be only to see the Disputation fairely carried, and that the Reasonings and Arguings to and fro be pertinent, and close, and direct to the Point in hand; and therefore to me its all of one and the same consideration, who is the Man that shall undertake it.

Two Moderators chosen, Mr. Griffith, and Mr. Ames.

Mr. Symp. If you please, we shall desire one of the Moderators to speak a word unto the Lord, for it is the Rule of the Apostle, to doe all things in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and unto God by him.

Mr. Ames then Prayed, &c. And afterwards the dispute proceeded thus:

Mr. Symp. Sir, this is your Position ( as I have received it from the hand of Mr. Powel ) which I intend, by the assistance of the Lord, to oppose; *That Jesus Christ on Gods Part, and on his own Part, in His Death, died intentionally to save all the Posterity of Adam.* Is this the Position that you intend to maintaine?

Mr. Goodw. If it please you, there are no termes, in that tenor, or forme, that doe much displease me, but I had rather contract



it if you will, and let it be thus, *that Iesus Christ Died intentionally for all Men, or the Death of Christ Was intended by God for all Men.*

Mr. Ames. Sir, there seemes ( I humbly conceive ) to be a necessity for the putting in of some other words to the right stating of this question : those who understand the great Controversie betweene the one, and the other, in this Point, call for some other stating of it, as namely thus. *Whether or no Iesus Christ, in His Death and Passion, did equally intend the Salvation of all the Posterity of the first Adam, one and other, without any difference; pardon Me Sir herein, that I am put upon it to speak.*

Mr. Goodw. Sir, I conceive a pardon is only in case of offence, and transgression, but I know none that you have committed in what you have now spoken; only I suppose that the interposition of that word *equally* will not so much modell the Question, as multiply questions, and of one, it will beget many; for to inquire, whether *Christ Died equally for all*, it seemes to import this, not only whether Christ, in the first and primary intention of His Death, did intend the Salvation of all Men; but whether, notwithstanding any difference that should arise in Men, from themselves, in the course of their Lives, and Conversations afterwards, whether yes after any such difference, as for example after their Apostacy, or committing the sin against the Holy Ghost, that yet the Death of Christ was, or is then, *equally* referrable, and relating to the Salvation of these Men, as well as of any other; Now this ( as I say ) is a question altogether excentricall to that question which we are now come together to argue, and to consider of.

Mr. Symp. Mr. Moderator, if you please let that alone for it will fall in of it self. Sir, I prove then, *that Iesus Christ did not die intentionally for all the posterity of Adam.*

Mr. Goodw. Very well.

Mr. Symp. First Argument, *If Christ Died intentionally for the Salvation of all the Posterity of Adam, then he Died as a means of their Salvation; But he did not die as a meanes of their Salvation, and therefore he did not die for all the Posterity of Adam.*

Mr. Goodw. For the present I shall not distinguish, but deny your

your Minor ; I shall have opportunity to distinguish it afterwards in the prosecution.

Mr. *Symp.* The Proposition to be proved is this, That Jesus Christ did not die as a meanes for the Salvation of all Men; which I prove thus, If He Died as a meanes of the salvation of all Men, He Died as an effectuall or as an ineffectuall meanes ; But Jesus Christ neither Died as an effectuall nor as an ineffectuall : And therefore He did not die as a meanes at all.

Mr. *Goodw.* I answer, by distinguishing of your Minor Proposition ; in one sence He Died as a meanes *effectuall*, and in another sence not ; He Died as a meanes *effectuall* thus, that there was nothing more required on His Part, nor of Him that should performe, or undertake the office of a *Mediator*, or maker of attonement for Man ; so far the means, which Christ exhibited in His Death, it was as *effectuall* as effectualnesse it self, or any efficacy whatsoever could be : but if by *effectuall* you meane, such a means which doth *take effect*, that is, which doth end, and issue in the salvation of all : so I affirme that Christ Died as a Means *ineffectuall*.

Mr. *Symp.* I conceive that this answer of yours is no answer at all to my argument : my reason is this, because I look upon all the posterity of *Adam*, not as Believers, or Unbelievers, but only under that notion, and consideration, as the Posterity of *Adam*, and so my argument is not yet answered : for if all the Posterity of *Adam* be lookt upon, Jesus Christ did not die as an effectuall, or ineffectuall means of their Salvation ; and therefore your Answer doth not reach my Argument in hand ; answer therefore to it, as the posterity of *Adam*, whether Christ Died for them, and whether His Death was an effectuall, or an ineffectuall means of their Salvation ?

Mr. *Goodw.* Sir, will you please thus, I did nor, neither do I intend, in that Answer which I have given, nor in any which I shall give, to make answer to any thing that is in your conception beneath, either on the one hand of your Argument, or on the other, but take your Argument in that forme and tenor of words wherein it was directed to me, and so I have cleerly answered it : for your Proposition was, that *Christ Died neither as a means effectuall, nor ineffectuall* : and I have shewed how your conjunction



junction is invalid; and how, and in what sense, he dyed as an *effectual* means, and how not: Now if you would take away my Answer, you must prove, That Christ dyed in no sense as a means *effectual*, nor in any sense as a means *ineffectual*, for the Salvation of all men.

Mr Ames. Sir, the distinction (of the Respondant) is this, That the Death of Christ is in a sense *effectual* for the Salvation of all, and in a sense not. Now you are to answer to what part of the distinction you please.

Mr Symp. If the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ be not *effectual* for all, in any sense, then your Answer is not good: But the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ is not *effectual* for all, in any sense: Ergo.

Mr Goodm. Prove your minor, and you shall do well.

Mr Symp. Sir, I desire you plainly to shew me in what sense it is *effectual*; for it is a clear contradiction to say, that the same thing should be *effectual*, and *ineffectual* also.

Mr Goodm. I have explained it in part, and shall be willing to do it yet more fully: In this sense therefore I say, that the Death of Christ is *effectual* for all; that is, In case all men shall believe (as I suppose they may, having means vouchsafed by God unto them for that end,) there needs no more dying, nor atonement, nor sacrifice, for the Salvation of all these men, then that which Jesus Christ hath already exhibited and performed; but there is a virtue, worth, substance, and what ever is requisite in an atonement, or sacrifice, for the Salvation of all men. But now if you respect the event, or issue of this Sacrifice, and Atonement; that is, Whether all men come in time to be saved by it or no; in this sense it is *ineffectual*, in point of event; but it is most *effectual* every way, in respect of intrinsecal worth, and value. This is my clear sense.

Mr Symp. I prove, That Christ did not dye as an *effectual* means for all, or as a Sacrifice for all men, thus: If God did not intend to give that to some, without which he certainly knew that it could not be an *effectual* means to all, then Jesus Christ did not dye as an *effectual* means for all: But God did not intend to give that to some, without which it could not be an *effectual* means to all; and therefore, on Gods part, it was not an *effectual* means to all.

Mr Goodm. I answer briefly to the Major Proposition, or indeed

to either, That the efficacy of the Death of Christ for all men, it doth not at all depend, nor hath it any relation to any intention in God otherwise; that is, either to give this or that to any man, or unto all men, which should make it *de facto*, or *eventually* effectual to all; but the efficacy of the Death of Christ is to be measured, and judged of, by the intrinsecal and essential value and worth of it, and not by any thing that God should do, in any other Dispensation of his, for, or towards, the Salvation of men.

Mr Sympf. You give me no Answer to my Argument, which is, *That it is not an effectual means on Gods part, because he was resolved not to give that, without which it could not be effectual.*

Mr Goodw. This I denyed, and gave you this reason for it, because Gods giving, or not giving, (though my Judgment is, that he doth give sufficient means to all to render the Death of Christ effectual to them, though it is not necessary for me to declare my Judgment in this point: ) But this is sufficient, as to the Answer of your Argument, That the efficacy of the Death of Christ for all is not suspended, or doth not depend upon any Intention of God, touching any other Dispensation to men, one, or more; but before any such Intention be considerable in him, the Death of Christ is as *efficacious*, and as *inefficacious*, as ever it will be; the nature, virtue, worth, and value of it doth not suffer any change, either diminution, or augmentation, by any after-dispensation whatsoever.

Mr Sympf. I suppose your Answer doth not reach my Argument, neither is there any validity in what you say; for if what you say be true, then there is a Contradiction in the Intentions of God: For there is one Intention (say you) wherewith he intends the Salvation of all men; and, according to my Argument, there is another Intention, That he will not save all men: So that there seems to be a Contradiction in the Intention of God.

Mr Ames. I humbly conceive, that you are come to the head of this Argument, and that your sence (Mr Goodwin) is this; That the Death and Passion of Jesus Christ doth carry in it worth, and merit, every way sufficient for the Salvation of all those that shall by Faith, through Grace, lay hold upon it; and that there is also a sufficiency in it, even for those who dye in their unbelief: And I humbly conceive that this doth not at all cross the learned Opponents sence.

Mr Goodw.



Mr Goodw. I should be very glad that he and I could meet together in this.

Mr Ames. Sir, I suppose (Mr Symphon) your sense is not To oppose the sufficiency of the merit of the Death of Christ for all men; but the universality of Intention on Gods part, in the Death of Christ for a Ransom for all men.

Mr Symps. My Argument is not yet answered: I prove, That there is not any such Intention on Gods part; for then there should be contradictory Intentions in him, if, according to Mr Goodwins Opinion, he intends the Salvation of all; and, according to that which I prove, there is an Intention that he will not save all: Because he will not give that to some, without which the Death of Christ could not be effectual to them.

Mr Ames. I humbly conceive that this is a second Argument.

Mr Symps. No; It is but a further progress in the Argument: I prove, That God did not intend it as an effectual means, because he did not intend to do that, without which he knew it would not be effectual: and if God did intend it as an effectual means, then there is a Contradiction in Gods Intention.

Mr Griffith. If you please Sir, draw it up into an Argument.

Mr Symps. If God intended the Death of Christ as a means for the Salvation of all, then there are Contradictions in the Intentions of God: But there are no Contradictions in Gods Intentions. Ergo.

Mr Griffith. Then there are Contradictory Intentions in God; I suppose you mean, Sir.

Mr Goodw. I deny your Major Proposition: It doth not follow from hence, from Gods Intention that the Death of Christ should be Effectual for all, that therefore there should be contradictory Intentions in God. If you please, a proof of that, and I shall give you an account of this in my Answer.

Mr Symps. God intended that the Death of Christ should not be an Effectual means for the Salvation of some; and therefore if he intended the Salvation of all by his Death, as a means, then there are contradictory Intentions in the minde of God.

Mr Goodw. To this, Answer hath been made before. The Law of Contradictions, and contradictory Intentions, must relate *ad idem*; it must be in respect of one and the same sence, wherein both



both the Propositions, pretended to be contradictory, one to the other, must be understood. As to the point in hand; We say, that in one sence God did intend the Death of Christ to be *Effectual* to all; and in other sence he intended it to be *ineffectual*. I gave you an account of my distinction thus; In this sence God did intend it an *Effectual* means to all; that is, In case that all the World should beleeve, there should be a fountain, and plenty of Salvation for all men, in it. But now in the other sence, wherein I say, that God did not intend it as an *Effectual* means, my meaning is this, That he did not intend, that all men, nor any one man, whatsoever, should ever partake of this satisfaction by the Death of Christ, but only by, and upon, his beleeving. In this sence, I say, God did intend that the Death of Christ should be *ineffectual* to all men, if Intentions may be negative in God, though I would not use that term; but I follow your Argument, and I trust to the capacity of all that hear me.

Mr Sympf. I oppose your Answer thus; You say, That God did intend the Death of Christ as a means in one sence, and not in another: You say, He intended it not as an *Effectual* means for those who should not beleeve, but he did intend it as an *Effectual* means to all those who should beleeve. This I apprehend is the substance of your Answer.

Mr Goodw. No, Sir; There is one thing wanting: For my Answer imports, That even for those who do not beleeve, the Death of Christ is sufficient (and that according to the Intention of God) as well as for those who do beleeve; else I should not maintain an agreement with my self. But in this sence I deny, that God did intend it to be *Effectual*; namely, that it should actually produce, or raise, or bring to effect, the Salvation of those, who should not beleeve.

Mr Sympf. I do not speak of that as all; I onely speak of the Death of Christ in a general way, in relation to all the posterity of Adam, not considering them as Beleevers, or Unbeleevers.

Mr Goodw. Very well; So I say it was *Effectual* for all.

Mr Sympf. I prove, it could not be, because God did intend that it should not be *Effectual* for some of the posterity of Adam.

Mr Goodw. Observe the inequality of your Reason; You say, That you do not consider men, in your Argument, as Beleevers, or

*Unbelievers; but when you come to enforce your Argument, then you distinguish them, which is not fair.*

*Mr Symps.* No: I look upon the posterity of *Adam* not as Believers, or Unbelievers; and prove, That God did really intend that some of this posterity should not be saved by the Death of Christ.

*Mr Gough.* If you please, thus; I do not say, or did I ever say, or think, That God did ever intend to save all, or any man actually, by the Death of Christ, but upon, and by means of, his believing; and at the same time, when he did intend the Salvation of all men, he did intend likewise the Condemnation and perishing of all those that should dye in their unbelief: And these two Intentions have no manner of repugnancy in God, but are as fair, and brotherly, and as friendly, and will lodge together in the same infinite Love and Grace, there being no manner of opposition, nor face of contrariety, between them.

*Mr Amos.* I humbly conceive that the Disputation sticks here, in a non-right-understanding of that distinction concerning the Efficaciousness of the death of Christ: For in one sense, *Scilicet*, you are pleased to understand it Effectual to all, namely, so far only as it carries in it a sufficiency; and in another, as it carries a certainty of event, so you understand it ineffectual. Now we humbly intreat you, because these phrases, or distinctions, of Effectualness and Ineffectualness, are not plainly understood; that therefore you would please to explain your self a little further, as to this.

*Mr Gough.* I thought that I had explained my self to the apprehensions of most: My sense is clearly this; When I say that God did intend the Death of Christ to be Effectual unto all men, my meaning is, That he did intend that it should be of such a nature, tendency, worth, merit, and value; that there is no creature, nor person, in all the world, man, or woman, but that they might be saved by it; that is, In case they should believe in Jesus Christ, they should not suffer loss of Salvation, for want of merit, atonement, or reconciliation, made with God for their sins. In this sense I affirm it to be Effectual to all, and that according to the Intention of God. But then, if by Effectual you mean this; That God should intend, that all men should be actually saved, whether they believe or no; that is, without all manner of consideration, that the



the Death of Christ should yet be Effectual to all; So I deny, that God intended that it should have any efficacy at all for any man, in order unto his Salvation.

Mr Symps. Now I do somewhat more fully understand your meaning: You say, It is an effectual means in this sense, because God doth intend, that whosoever beleeves in Jesus Christ, shall be saved by his Death, as an effectual atonement. Now against this Answer I form this Argument: If God did intend that some men should not beleieve, and did blinde others, when the Gospel was preached unto them, that they should not be able to see the truth of it; then God did not intend that this should be an effectual means for the Salvation of all men; upon condition of beleieving: But God did blinde some men, to whom the Gospel was preached, and would not suffer them to behold this means; and therefore he did not really intend the Death of Jesus Christ, as an effectual means, or as an atonement, for the Salvation of all men.

Mr Goodwin. I might here deny both the Propositions; and the reason why I deny the major is this, because God may upon the demerit, or mis-behaviour of men, their unworthy carriage under the means of Grace vouchsafed unto them, he may harden their hearts, and blinde their eyes, and put them into an incapacity of beleieving, and so of being saved; and yet notwithstanding he may Originally, that is, without the consideration of this miscarriage in them, he may intend their Salvation, as well as the Salvation of any other men.

Mr Symps. Will you grant me then the Minor Proposition?

Mr Goodwin. If you please to repeat it, I shall weigh it, and then give an account of it.

Mr Symps. If God did not intend to give the means of Grace to some, and did intend to blinde the eyes of others; then he did not intend the Death of Christ as an Effectual means for all: But God did not intend to give the means of Grace to some; and did decree with himself to blinde the eyes of others, to whom the means was given, that they should not beleieve; and therefore he did not really, and in good earnest, and without hypocrisie, intend the Salvation of all the posterity of Adam.

Mr Griffith. The Answer which Mr Goodwin gave to the Major Proposition, I conceive, lay fair for you to oppose, which was,



That notwithstanding God might primarily intend the Salvation of all men; yet, upon some after-miscarriages in men, he might blinde them, and give them up to the hardness of their hearts, and to unbelief; so that they should be in an incapacity of beleeving unto Salvation. Now, upon the disabling of the Major Proposition, the Minor is of no force.

Mr Symp. This doth not reach my Argument.

Mr Goodw. It is an Answer to your Major Proposition: For this is not my meaning, That however men behave, or quit themselves under the means of Salvation, that they should be saved by Christ notwithstanding; this is no part of my meaning: but considering men coming into the world, and as they are born of Adam; so God doth intend really, faithfully, and cordially, That whosoever be he, of all this posterity, that shall come in, and beleeve, he shall finde Salvation, in the same manner, and upon the same terms, that the best, and greatest Beleevers in the World, ever did. And if you please now to answer against this sence, the Disputation will go on.

Mr Symp. If God decreed, before some men were born, that they should not beleeve in Jesus Christ, then God did not really intend the Death of Christ as a sufficient means for all. But God did really intend, before some men were born, or had done good, or evil, that they should not beleeve; therefore he did not intend the Death of Christ as a sufficient means for all, upon condition of beleeving.

Mr Goodw. I beleeve if I should deny your Major Proposition, it would be very hard for you to prove.

Mr Symp. I prove it from Joh. 12. 39, 40. Therefore they could not beleeve, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, &c.

Mr Goodw. If you please, thus; If by Gods not intending to give means of beleeving to some men, your meaning be, That he did not intend to give it to some sorts of men, or to some kinde and condition of men in the World, as namely, to men under such or such a condition of sin and ungodliness; So I grant, That God did not intend to give the means of Salvation to all. As for example,

to explaine my Answer thus; Those that sin against the Holy Ghost, or those that are spoken of under those passages of *blinding their eyes, and hardning their hearts*, God might intend from eternity not to give Faith, or means of Faith, to such men as these, and yet notwithstanding he might Decree, or purpose to give a sufficiency of means unto all men, and so to these men themselves considered as not yet run into those arrears of sin, and rebellion against God, and the reason why God commeth in after time, to deny them a capacity, or means to believe, it doth not proceed from any originall intention of God in this respect, but it doth arise from their own reached and unworthy carriage towards God under the meanes of Salvation.

Mr. Symp. Your Answer doth not reach my Argument, for my Argument Proves that there are a People that God intended not to give the means of grace to before the world was.

Mr. Griffith, Mr. Goodwin. Saith that God did not decree this to them (viz. that he would give them means of Grace) considered as the sons of Adam, but considered as under such, and such an unworthinesse.

Mr. Symp. If the decree was before they were borne, then it cannot be in consideration of any unworthinesse in the Creature; But this decree was taken up by God before the Creature was borne; and before it had done good, or evil: therefore it cannot be from any unworthinesse in the Creature. This Argument is founded upon the Scripture, and I conceive we should not only urge our reason, but the Scripture upon which our reason is founded.

Mr. Goodw. If you please to give me leave to answer, you may have the more scope afterwards to speak what you have to say. I answer that the decree of God, not to give Faith to such, or such men; or if you will to such, and such a sort of men, so, and so qualified; this decree of his, and to all his decrees whatsoever, they are in Him (according to our usuall expression) from eternity, and that without any respect at all had to man, they are independant, and irrevocable. But if you come to matter of execution of these His decrees, which is that we have under consideration, so God doth never intend the execution of any such Decree of His, as the actuall blinding of men, &c. until they them-



themselves have contracted the most notorious and horrid guilt of wilfull sin, and disobedience against Him; the Decrees of God concerning the Creature before the Creature is in being, these are in himself absolute, and peremptory, so that I suppose an absolute Decree in God from eternity; but the execution of this His Decree is according to the state and condition wherein the Creature shall be found.

Mr. *Samp.* Will you grant that there is an eternall Decree in God concerning some Particular Persons, that they shall be blinded from himself; and yet that the same God from all eternity shall Decree, that the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ should be an effectuall means for these mens Salvation?

Mr. *Goodw.* If you please Sir, you wholly mistake my Answer in that, and are altogether beside it; and how then is it possible for you to argue to the edification of the People? My Answer is not, that God Decreed from eternity to give or not to give to any Particular Person the means of grace, or of believing; but that his Decree is not to give to such a Species, or (if you will) to such a sort, or kinde of Men; not to these Men or to those that prove in time to be of that sort, and kinde; that is not my meaning; but that God from eternity Decreed, that such, and such a sort of Men, who have advanced, and made long progresse in wayes of sin, and disobedience, that these shall be deprived of that capacity of believing, which was sometime vested in them. As thus, to explaine my Answer, The Law of this State, (or of any other) enacts the punishment of Death against all kinde of Murtherers whatsoever, that shall be found in that State; now this Law it doth not Decree, that this, or that particular man by name, as *Thomas*, or *William*, or the like, who in time come to commit Murther, that this or that man shall be put to death; but it doth as much decree, that the most innocent and best deserving men in all the State shall be put to death as well as he that proves the Murtherer, in case they prove so also. And this is my sence concerning the Decrees of God. He decrees, that such, and such men, who shall be rebellious to such, and such a Decree, and period of wickednesse, that these shall be deprived of the means of grace, and of believing; but this doth not suppose, that such or such persons, personally considered, who fell under



under these Decrees of His, that they were any way Deceiv'd, or Determin'd by him to be denied the means of grace from eternity, or to fall under this his Decree.

Mr. Symp. If God hath Decreed, that some Particular Persons should not believe; but that they should be blinded by himself from all eternity, and that not in consideration of their sin and wickednesse; then your Answer is not sufficient to my Argument. But God from all eternity hath Decreed, that some Particular men should not believe, but that they should be blinded; and therefore your Answer is not sufficient.

Mr. Goodw. I deny your Minor Proposition: God did not Decree from eternity against any Particular person, that without relation to their sin, they should be blinded, or made incapable of believing.

Mr. Symp. The Proposition which I am to prove is this, That God did intend that some Particular Persons should not believe from all eternity; and for this I shall give you severall Scriptures; the first is that, *Iude 4. For there are certaine Men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly Men, turning the Grace of God unto lasciviousnesse, &c.*

Mr. Goodw. Your Argument from this Scripture.

Mr. Symp. If there were some ordained from eternity to condemnation, not in consideration of any sinne: or if they were ordained to this ungodlineffe here spoken of; then did God from eternity intend that some Particular Persons should not believe: but there were some ordained from eternity to this condemnation, not in reference or consideration of their sinne: and therefore God intended that some Particular Persons should be blinded and not be able to believe.

Mr. Goodwin Reads the words.

Mr. Symp. I querie here two things: first whether God did ordaine them from eternity to this condemnation; or, secondly, if not, whether He ordained them to these sins; one of these two must needs be the meaning of this Scripture.

Mr. Goodw. I have told you already in what sense these Men (and so all like to them.) were ordained of old unto condemnation: (if by *old* you will understand *eternity*, which cannot be proved to be the meaning of the word in this place, but rather

it

it is to be understood (as some interpret it) of the old Testament.) Yet if by old you understand eternity, it will not follow from hence, that these Persons personally considered, were ordained to condemnation from eternity, that is together irrelative. I grant that God did Decree and Ordaine from eternity, or of old that these Men, that is such as these were, and so these Persons too in a consequentiall way, they were ordained to this condemnation by God; but its cleare from this Scripture that the reason, or that which makes them to fall under this ordination of His, it is their ungodlinesse, or turning the grace of God into lasciviousnesse. Now if you can prove that God did ordaine of old, that these Men by name should be ungodly, and should turne the grace of God into lasciviousnesse; then, and not till then do you take away my Answer.

Mr. Symp. There are diverse things in your Answer. First that the Apostle speaks of Particular Persons, it is plaine.

Mr. Goodw. I grant that, but He doth not speak of them in that consideration, as they were *Thomas*, or *William* or the like, but because they were Men of such and such a demerit, and under such and such sins and provocations.

Mr. Symp. This is your Answer, you say they were ordained to condemnation, but it was upon this consideration that they should be ungodly Men.

Mr. Goodw. This is not my Answer, for I say that the ordination of God is irrelative, and hath no respect, or dependance upon any Mans righteousness, or unrighteousnesse, the Decree was past with God, and stated, and established in himself, before any thing was in being, as touching the godlinesse, or ungodlinesse of men, but this is that which I say that the tenor, and import of this Decree of His was this, that not any Particular men, no not these more then others, should be ordained to condemnation, but that these, or whosoever else should fall into the same course of disobedience, and unworshippesse they should be all condemned.

Mr. Ames, Sir, I humbly desire you in behalf of the People that whereas you was pleased, even now to assert the eternall Decrees of God concerning the Creature before the foundation of the world was laid, and now seeme to hint a difference even in those eternall Decrees;



Decrees; I humbly request to know your judgement whether, or no they depend upon the future condition of the Creature, which is contingent, or whether they be absolute, independant, and peremptory in themselves?

Mr. Goodw. Your question is very faire, and pertinent, and may help to give a further light into the businesse in hand; and therefore my Answer to it is this, I conceive that those Decrees of God from eternity, they doe suppose a possibility of such states and conditions of men in time to be, or that there will be such and such a generation of men as those Decrees do suppose, and lay out; but they doe not suppose any absolute necessity of such, and such men, of such and such qualities, or qualifications to be: and this is my sence touching your question.

Mr. Ames. Sir, I humbly crave leave to aske another question, and to reply thus far, that if so be these Decrees of God which even now you were pleased to grant were peremptory, absolute, and irreversible, are now suppositive of a state and condition of the Creature, these two Assertions doe not seeme, I humbly conceive, to consist together; if they were absolute in God (as you was pleased to declare) from eternity, and yet have an eye upon the different sorts or kinds of Men, that one part of them is hypobeticall, and suppositive of such or such a state.

Mr. Goodw. No Sir, if you understood me so, then there was so much mistake in my Answer: my sence is this, and I would have both my sence, and meaning, and minde, and judgement in these questions drawn out to the utmost, and as far as I have any thought, or peece of a thought in me, I desire not to cancele, or hide any thing from the view or cogniscence of any, and therefore I accompt my self really and in good earnest, beholding to any man, that shall administer an occasion, or give me an opportunity to expresse, and hold forth to the utmost, what God hath enabled me to conceive in them. And therefore for that whereas there may seeme to be an inconsistency between these two Assertions (as you seeme to conceive) that the Decrees of God should be absolute and independant, upon the Creature; and yet that they should be relative to such, and such a state or condition of Men: I conceive that there is no manner, no nor scarce so much as the face of an inconsistency between them, for when I say the De-



crees of God are *absolute and irreversible*, I do within this terme, or word *Decree* include and presuppose such and such a state, or kinde of men; as for example, God Decrees that such, and such sorts of men shall be blinded, and hardned in their hearts, that is men of such, and such a demerit; Now when I say this Decree is absolute and irreversible my meaning is not, neither doe I say that it shall have no relation to any possible condition of the creature, but it is *irreversible, and absolutely independant upon the Creature* thus, that God doth not take up this Decree, nor is He moved, or inclined to it by any extrinsecall, or moving cause; not by any thing in man, nor by any thing done by man, no nor from the nature of sin it selfe, but this flowes meerly from his pure, absolute, and intire Will, together with the infinite purity, and holinesse of his Nature, and of His Wisdom, for they are all summoned together in all His Decrees, there is an ingredieney and concurrence of all the great and glorious Perfections of God: and these Decrees I say are taken up by Him without any manner of motion from the Creature inclining Him thereunto; He workes all things according to the Counsell of His own Will, His own pure, absolute, and independant Will, and this is the tenor and the state of it, that such, and such Creatures: such and such men who shall thus, and thus transgress, and persevere, thus resisting wilfully against Him, they shall be hardned, and blinded: So that there is no inconsistency at all in these two Assertions.

*Mr. Ames.* I humbly crave leave once more to reply; you are pleased to declare these Decrees of God to be originally in Himself, without any extrinsecall motive perswading him hereunto, Sir, do you speak (I beseech you) of those two sorts of Men, which these Decrees do finde in different states in the World, or doe you speak only of that Decree which terminates it self only in one of these sorts or kindes of Men, which it meets withall here.

*Mr. Goodw.* Sir, I do by the Decrees of God (in the notion wherein I expresse my self) intend all, and all manner of Decrees, which have any relation to the Creature, under what possible condition soever included in them: as if you will name any Decree you shall finde such, and such a kinde of Creature mentioned and included in it: and I understand the Decrees of God

univer-

universally, all such as have any respect to the Creature, or to any state of the Creature, and I conceive that all the Decrees of God whatsoever (I speak a great deal of my sence at once in this) respect sorts and kinds of mens persons under such, and such a qualification, and that none of them respect any Particular Person whatsoever personally considered.

Mr. Symp. This is your Answer, that the eternall Decrees of God doe respect certaine sorts of Men and not Particular Persons amongst Men: But the Decrees of God do respect some Particular Persons amongst men, and not so much some sorts and kinds of men, and therefore this Answer of yours is not sufficient to my Argument.

Mr. Goodw. I deny your Minor Proposition.

Mr. Symp. I prove it from, Rom. 9. 11. For the children being not yet borne, neither having done any good or evill, that the purpose of God according to election might stand not of works, but of him that calleth: it was said unto her, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated: Here it is plaine that Gods Decree doth respect Particular Person, to wit Jacob and Esau, and therefore it doth not respect some Sorts of men: its cleer I say from this instance, and likewise from that concerning Pharaoh in the latter part of this Chapter.

Mr. Goodw. To your Argument I answer thus, that there is nothing can be proved from hence for your purpose: neither doth any thing appeare to make out any such conclusion, for first (But all where you render the words thus, for the children being not yet borne you will finde (if you look) that there is no such word as Children in the Originall, and you may easily perceive it in the Translation, it being inserted in a different Character, and though I have many things to say concerning this place, yet I desire that this first may be taken notice of, that those whom the Apostle here speaks of, they were not so much the Persons of Jacob and Esau as the Posterity of both, and this is most cleer and evident in that Parallel place of Scripture from whence this is cited, which is Gen. 25. 23, 24. And the children (saith the story of Moses) Strugled together within her, and shee said if it be so why was I thus, and she went to inquire of the Lord. And the Lord said unto her, (marke, here was the

Divine oracle which the Apostle relates ) *two Nations are in thy womb, and two manner of People shall be separated from thy bowells, and the one People shall be stronger then the other People, and the elder shall serve the younger.* Therefore it is plaine that there is no manner of Decree, nor nothing spoken of the persons of *Jacob* and *Esau*, personally considered, but only concerning their posterity.

Againe secondly, I answer Further (which I desire may be diligently noted, for I suppose that a cleere understanding of this place will open a great light to the question now in hand) if you will please therefore to take the spring of the first rile of the Apostles arguing in this passage of Scripture; you must begin at the sixth Verse : And you will cleerly see that the Apostle had nothing to do, it was no part of his scope to argue the point of election from eternity, but that which he had to doe it was to prosecute and to give further confirmation to the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, which he had set on foot, and managed all along this Epistle to this very place ; for the Apostle Writing his Epistle chiefly to the *Jews*, he doth declare unto them how that God Himself did Preach this very Doctrine unto their fore-Fathers, the great Patriarchs, and Founders of their Nation, and People, and that first unto *Abraham*, and afterwards to *Isaac*, and his Family as if you mind the carriage of the place you will cleerly see in the sixth Verse, not as if the Word of God had taken none effect, for they are not all *Israel* which are of *Israel*. He doth here anticipate an Objection which the *Jews*, would be ready to make against the Doctrine of Justification which he had handled, and Preached to them.

*M. Symp.* Under favour, I conceive it is against the Lawes of disputation for you to speak so much, we did not come hither to here you Preach a Sermon, but give me a short Answer to my Argument, that so I may reply, My Argument is that the Decrees of God doe respect Particular Persons, and I prove this from *Jacob* and *Esau*, and in stead of giving an Answer to it you fall upon a long and tedious Discourse to little purpose, which is not faire.

*M. Goodw.* Will you say it is not faire to open the Scriptures upon which we argue, or doe you desire that the sense and mind



of God, in what you say and produce, should not be understood? Do you mean to argue in the dark? and will you not have the minde of God brought forth into the light?

*Mr. Am.* I humbly intreat leave to desire, that you would please to contract your Answer to the 11, and 12. Verses, which Mr. Symphon hath propounded as a ground to prove his Proposition denyed by you.

*Mr. Goodw.* If the 11, and 12. Verses cannot be understood, nor an account given of them, without shewing the scope, and Context, and Coherence of the place, then, if I be long, and you finde fault, you do not reflect so much upon me, as upon the Word of God it self, which is so mysterious and deep, and so remote from the common apprehensions of men, that it cannot be understood otherwise. But I shall undertake (upon the opening and clearing of the Apostles minde in the Context) to shew, that your Argument from this place is altogether irrelative to your purpose.

*Mr. Ames.* I humbly conceive that the 11. Verse may readily receive an Answer from you, without reference to the fore-going Verses, and that according to the reading which you were pleased to give us out of the Greek, namely, That there is no mention made there of Children, as you learnedly observed. And I humbly conceive it lieth much more upon the Foundation of that Consequence which the Apostle brings in the 11. Verse; which 11. Verse is a general rule concerning Election, and the Purpose of God, The children being not yet born, that the Purpose of God according to Election might stand, and that without any reference to the Works of the Creature. I humbly conceive that this is the Foundation which the Apostle layeth in the 11. Verse, without any relation to his former Discourse, unless it be to ground it upon.

*Mr. Goodw.* If you please to minde the words, you will see that the whole Verse is inserted in a Parenthesis, and it lieth within the body, of the Context, in Coherence, which cannot be clearly and fully understood, without the opening of what went before.

*Mr. Ames.* I humbly intreat one Word more; What end you observe that these words lie within a Parenthesis, I conceive that a Parenthesis hath no dependance upon the Context.

*Mr. Griffith.* What is pertinent to the opening of a Text, men think should be for the edification of all.

*Mr. Goodw.* If you please to minde the first particular in the 11.

Verse [For] which is a Rationative Particle; it doth lead us, as it were, by the hand, and carries us back to what went before; and there is a Reason given in it of somewhat which the Apostle had before asserted.

Mr. *Symps.* I humbly conceive that the Parent begins at these words, That the Purpose of God according to Election might stand, not off Works, but off him that calleth; and that the other hath reference to the former discourse. *Mr. Goodwin.* Then, if I you please, we will only go to the Verse immediately before; for I suppose that this preface discourse betwixt us, and discussion of this business, the main intent and drift of it is not, that you or I be pleased, but that the Congregation and People of God be edified; and therefore whatsoever doth, in a clear and direct way, tend to their edification, that I conceive ought not to be denied, either by me, in reference to you, or by you, in reference unto me; and the opening of this Scripture may, I conceive, tend much that way.

Mr. *Symps.* This was my Argument, That the Decrees of God do respect particular Persons; and for the proof of this, I cited this place, where *Jacob* and *Esau* are spoken of, and *Pharaoh* afterwards; and therefore the Decrees of God do respect particular persons, and not men of such and such a sort, as you say. though, if you please, that we may not be wearisome to the Congregation, we will let that of *Jacob* and *Esau* alone, and go to *Pharaoh*, or unto some other Scripture.

Mr. *Goodwin.* No; there is a great deal more yet to be said to it. Nay, I suppose it is the most material piece of Scripture that possibly you could have fallen upon.

Mr. *Symps.* I desire then a short Answer to my Argument.

Mr. *Goodwin.* I have shewed you before, That all Gods Decrees they are preteritaneous to any Creature, before it was a being; for God hath no temporary Decrees, such as are taken up in time; this was absolutely denied before. But this is that which I say, That if you will understand the place of the persons of *Jacob* and *Esau*, (for in the process of the discourse I would have granted you that, though it be more then the place will afford, and that place in *Genesis* is directly contrary to it, for it is spoken of two Nations, *Two Nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated*

*noted from by bawls; ) yet whether you respect the two Nations,*  
 or the two Heads of these Nations, to wit, *Jacob and Esau,* the  
 Apostle doth not speak of them here, either under any consideration  
 or relation to their persons, nor simply to their posterity; but he  
 speaks of them, as of Types and Figures of Gods different Dispo-  
 sition, whereby he did declare, and teach the Nation of the Jews,  
 both in *Abrahams* Family, in the case of *Ismael* and *Isaac,* and in  
*Isaac's* Family, in the case of *Jacob* and *Esau,* the Doctrine of  
 Justification by Faith, which was the great Doctrine disputed and  
 depending between him and the Jews: And if you minde the Ar-  
 gument, you will see that he argues very plainly and evidently;  
*They are not all Israel (saith he) which are of Israel: neither be-*  
*cause they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: that is,*  
*They are not all heirs of Heaven that are the natural seed of Abra-*  
*ham. But in Isaac shall thy seed be called: that is, Those shall*  
*be counted for the seed of Abraham, who shall inherit, that shall*  
*be begotten and born, after the manner of Isaac, which was by*  
*Promise, for so he was born by force and virtue of a Promise, which*  
*was this, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son: and*  
*therefore, saith he, God did intend by this to shew, that those only*  
*should be the seed of Abraham, who should inherit, (at exkin)*  
*that should be born, not of the Law, the Bondwoman, but of the*  
*Promise, which was made to the World in Jesus Christ; and this*  
*was signified in Abrahams Family, in Ismael the son of the Bond-*  
*woman, and in Isaac the son of the Free-woman. And not onely*  
*so, (mark it,) but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, given*  
*by our father Isaac, before the children were born, or had done ei-*  
*ther good or evil, It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the*  
*younger: As if he had said, God did not onely teach this Doctrine*  
*of Justification by Faith, in opposition to Justification by the*  
*Works of the Law, in the Family of Abraham, and in the per-*  
*sons of Ismael and Isaac, the one being a child of Promise, and the*  
*other a son of the Bond-woman. But much more did he teach it in*  
*the Family of Isaac, in the case, and under the types, of Rebecca's*  
*two sons, Jacob and Esau; and the meaning of this phrase [And*  
*not onely this] is clearly this, Whereas the Jews might finde some*  
*exception against that instance which Paul had brought in Abra-*  
*hams Family, to wit, the example of Ismael, It's true (might*  
 they



they say) *he was rejected by God, and look upon us as strangers, and Isaac he was made the heir, but it was because Isaac was a rough fellow, and an ungracious son, and the like. But Isaac he was a Darling Child.* Now because the Jews were ready thus to object against that, therefore *Paul* comes upon them, and backs his former Argument, with another instance, against which there lay no exception in the least: *And not only this, which is, as if he had said thus; I know you will be apt to quarrel against what I now say, but I will produce you another instance, against which you shall have nothing to say: It is true, *Ismael* he was the son of *Hagar* the Bond-woman, and *Isaac* he was the son of the Free-woman; and therefore you will be ready to say, there was great reason why *Ismael* should be rejected for coming of the Bond-woman, he had no right to the inheritance; but *Isaac*, who came of the Free-woman, he had. But now (saith the Apostle) I will bring you another instance, against which you shall have no such thing to object, and that is of *Rebecca*; She also conceived by me, even by our father *Isaac*: Now ye cannot say, that *Esaü* and *Jacob* were born the one of the free-woman, and the other of the bond, and yet before they were born, that the Purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, It was said unto her, The Elder, &c. The meaning clearly is this; That the Purpose of God according to Election might stand: that is, That the Decree or Purpose of God, concerning those whom he would elect unto Life and Salvation, and make choyce of to inherit, that this Purpose of his might stand; that is, That it might appear to stand, and be declared to be firm, unalterable, and unchangeable: Therefore he brings in the case of the two sons of *Isaac*, *Esaü* and *Jacob*; Before they were yet born, or had done good or evil: The Apostle brings in this by way of Answer to that Objection which the Jews might make, which is, as if he should say, You cannot say here, that the one of these was an ungracious son, and the other toward, and gracious; but before they were born, or had done good or evil, it was said, (this was the Oracle from Heaven,) that the elder shall serve the younger: that is, That Justification by Faith (the younger Brother,) that is, the latter Covenant, the new Way, or Covenant of Life, which God had established with the World, this should have the preheminency, and take*

take place; and [the elder Brother] that is, the old way of Justification by Works, this should be servile to it: Of which two Covenants *Eſau* and *Jacob* were Types.

*Mr Ames.* Sir, I have only one Word humbly to present unto you, after this large Exposition of *Rom. 9.* which is, to intreat your ſence in this, Whether the Holy Ghoſt, in this place, where *Paul* ſpeaks of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, quoted out of *Genesis*, making this Particular ſerviceable to the ancient Decree; That the elder ſhould ſerve the younger, founded upon that eternal Adam, That the Decree of God according to Election ſhould ſtand; Whether this diſcourſe of the Apoſtle, bringing down this ancient Decree through ſeveral Families, and ſhewing it in the perſons of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, doth not demonſtrate, That the Decrees of God do take particular notice, and are determined upon particular perſons.

*Mr Goodwin.* I ſay, The Decrees of God reſpect particular perſons, but not under a particular conſideration.

*Mr Symps.* Yes, under a particular conſideration; and my Argument is this: If the Decrees of God do reſpect *Eſau* and *Jacob*, then they reſpect particular perſons: But here is a Decree of Election and Reprobation, which doth reſpect the perſons of *Jacob* and *Eſau*. Ergo.

*Mr Goodwin.* If you had put your Argument into ſuch terms, that my former Answer needed not to have been repeated, I would have ſaid ſomething to it; but this hath been answered before: He doth not ſay here in theſe words, that the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand, concerning *Eſau* and *Jacob* perſonally or particularly; but that Purpoſe of God according to Election, whereof he here ſpeaks, reſpects univerſally the whole World. And the reaſon why *Jacob* and *Eſau* are here mentioned, and for the reaſon of what was ſaid to the Mother of them, when ſhe was big with them, it was by way of confirmation of the Decrees of God from Eternity touching the whole world: For it's clear, The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the Purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand: He doth not ſay, That any Decree of Election, or Purpoſe of God about Election, in reference to *Jacob* and *Eſau*, might ſtand.

*Mr Symps.* It's plain, in reference to *Jacob* and *Eſau* perſonally.

as he proves it, *Esau have I hated, and Jacob have I loved.*  
 Mr Goodwin. That is nothing else but an Explication from the Prophet *Malachi* of the former Oracle of God, concerning these two children, as they were Heads of the Nations; and it doth no way prove, that the Decree here of Election did respect their particular persons, personally considered; no nor that they did respect their posterity; but only that these persons, and their posterity, were so ordered and disposed of by God, that they should serve, as it were, by way of Doctrinal Type and Instruction to the *WORLD*, how, and upon what terms; and under what Covenant, *GOD* would justify and save them.

Mr Sympson. Mr Moderator, you see what liberty Mr Goodwin takes in holding forth his Opinion. He hath delivered his thoughts, and I desire that I may have the same liberty to deliver my thoughts, and what I hold, concerning Election and Reprobation.

Mr Ames. Mr Sympson, If you please to discourse from the 11, and 12. Verses, and shew by a necessary Consequence, That Gods Purpose and Decree doth bind from Eternity particular persons, then shall you directly oppose the Answer which the learned Opponent hath given.

Mr Sympson. For that, I have plainly held it forth, and my Argument is not yet answered: I say, that *Jacob* and *Esau* were particular persons, and that the Decree of God respected them, and that before they had done either good or evil; That he loved the one before he had done any good, and hated the other before he had done any evil; and therefore the Decrees of God do not respect sorts or kindes of men, but particular persons: And that there are a particular number of men, whom God did love from Eternity, not from any fore-seen Faith or Works in them; And that there are a particular number of men, who are reprobated from Eternity, not in consideration of any sin or unbelief found in them. This is, that which I hold out, even an Eternal Decree of God concerning the Salvation of particular persons, not in consideration of Faith or Holiness in them, but merely from his own Love, or *Beneplacitum*, that being the ground of his Election: God doth not choose men because he fore-sees that they will be holy; but he doth therefore choose



choose them, that they may be holy, as the Apostle doth plainly make it out to us in *Ephes. 1. 4, 5.* where it is said, That we are elected in Christ Jesus, that we might be holy. So that no holiness or faith, or any thing in the creature, is the ground of electing of any person; but only the Will of God, who worketh all things (saith the Apostle) according to the counsel of his own Will; and therefore saith Christ, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto Babes; and when he had done so, he layeth down no other reason but this, *Even so, O Father, because it pleased thee.* And so likewise the Apostle in *Rom. 8.* in that golden Chain of Calling, and Justification, and Glorification, he doth not make them Antecedents to Election, (as they who hold Universal Redemption do,) but Consequences of Election; and this is the point which I desire liberty to prove, namely, That there are some particular persons hated of God from all eternity, and that there are others loved of God from eternity; and that God did really intend the Salvation of the one by the Death of Christ, and not in good earnest the Salvation of the other, but rather the aggravation of their condemnation thereby.

Mr. Ames. Here hath been much liberty of speaking, and it is now desired, that ye would betake your selves to a more strict way of Disputation. Mr. Goodwin, we humbly desire an Answer to those three Verses in *Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.* from whence it hath been intimated from Esau and Jacob, That the eternal Decrees of God have respect to particular persons.

Mr. Griffith. Both Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Symphon agree in this, That the Decrees of God from eternity do respect the persons of men, only one fastens it upon the state, and the other upon the person; and therefore, if it please you, I desire that they may be recalled to what they have said: And concerning this Scripture, so far as it concerns this Dispute, that they would only proceed, and then leave it to the Congregation.

Mr. Symphon. The words are not considerable as spoken of persons under such or such a state, for this reason, because it is said before they had done good or evil.

Mr. Goodwin. There hath been answer given to that already, there cannot be any thing proved here to be spoken of the two

children, but of the two Nations; and I told you moreover concerning those words, *That the purpose of God according to election might stand*: they contain that great Declaration of the absolute purpose of God, by which, and according to the tenor of which he intends to justify the world, and the Apostle had nothing to do about personal Election.

Mr Simpson. For that we must refer it to the wisdom which God hath given to his servants to judge, Whether Election be of particular persons, or of states and conditions. It is the desire of the Moderator that I address myself to a new Argument against your Position, which I do; *That Jesus Christ did not dye intentionally on his Fathers part, for all the posterity of Adam.* My Argument is this. Christ did not dye to save those whom his Father had actually damned before he suffered; But there were some that were actually damned before Jesus Christ suffered death, and therefore God the Father in the death of his son did not intend the Salvation of all men.

Mr Goodwin. I absolutely deny your Major Proposition, for it holds as effectually against those who dyed in the Faith of Jesus Christ, as those who dyed in their unbelief, if the death of Christ onely wrought forward.

Mr Simpson. I prove the Proposition, that God did not intend the Salvation of those who were damned, before the death of Christ, thus: It is an unreasonable thing for a man to intend the Salvation of him whom he knows certainly is already condemned, and we cannot think the true God to be so irrational as to intend the Salvation of those whom he certainly knew were actually condemned by himself before.

Mr Goodwin. The answer is very easy and ready.

Mr Simpson. Then let us have it, and not a discourse of half an hour long.

Mr Goodwin. It is every whit as irrational, that Christ should dye, to save those who were already actually saved, as it is to say that he should dye to save those who were already actually damned. But I deny your Major Proposition, and say, That the death of Christ is considerable two ways, either first in respect of the efficacy of it, and the intention of God in it; or secondly, in respect of the execution of it. In respect of the first, Christ dyed

[Lod]

as much from the beginning of the World, (at least upon the fall of Adam) as he did at that very houre when he was actually Crucified. And for the latter, those who were damned before the litterall Crucifying of Christ, yet they were not damned before such a Crucifying of Him, as was effectual to have saved them.

M. Symp. There are but three wayes to answer either *negando*, *limitando*, or *distingnendo*, either by denying, by limiting, or distinguishing, I beseech you either to deny one Proposition, or give some short distinction, or else leave some thing that I have spoken, that so we may go on in a Scholastick way.

M. Goodw. You desire me to give a short distinction, and yet you will not give me leave nor time to speak; repeat your Argument.

M. Symp. If God had actually damned some men before the Death of Christ, then he did not intend the Death of Christ as a meanes of their Salvation and consequently not of all. But God had actually damned some men before the Death of Christ, and therefore he did not intend the Death of Christ as a means for the Salvation of all.

M. Goodw. I answer by denying your major proposition with this distinction, that there were no men damned before the death of Christ in such a sence, and so considered as it was effectual to have saved them and my reason is chiefly this, because the death of Christ from the foundation of the World, was as effectual to have saved them, as it is to save those that should believe after the litterall and actual performance of it.

Mr. Ames. Mr. Simp. You are to prove that those who were in a state of condemnation, and perdition and damned in Hell, before the actual suffering of Christ had not a sufficient provision for Salvation, upon the accompt of the Death of Christ which they lived. You must prove that there was not a sufficient virtue in the Death of Christ, for the saving of them before the litterall execution of it, or His actual suffering upon the Crosse, and that there was no intention in God for their salvation by His Death, who were damned before he came into the World.

M. Symp. I prove it thus. If God had no intention to give Faith unto them, then he had no intention to save them by the Death



Death of Christ) But God had no intention to give Faith up to them, therefore He had no intention to save them by His Death. *M. Goodw.* I distinguish, first that Phrase of yours of giving Faith unto them, if by giving Faith you mean that God should give it to them, by an irresistible hand, or upon any such termes as that they could not but receive it: so I deny your major Proposition: if by giving Faith you meane (that which the Scripture doth in that Phrase which is) the giving men Faith in the means of it, that is such means which are proper and sufficient to produce and worke it, in this sense I affirme that God did give Faith up to these men: that is He gave sufficient means to them, whereby to have believed, and so to have been saved by the Death of Christ.

*M. Sym.* I prove that God did not give them sufficient means in this sense. If God did not give them the knowledge of the Gospel in any measure, then he did not give them sufficient means of believing, but God did not give them the knowledge of the Gospel in any measure.

*M. Goodw.* I deny both Propositions, for though God did not give them the knowledge of the Gospel, yet if he gave them means and opportunities, whereby to come to the knowledge of the Gospel, then he gave them sufficient means to believe. And then againe I deny the minor (for they are both tarty) that God did not give them the knowledge of the Gospel in any measure.

*M. Sym.* If God did suffer them to walk in their own blindness and darknesse, then he did not give them means for the knowledge of the Gospel: But God did suffer them, to walke in their own blindness and darknesse, therefore he did not give them sufficient means for the knowledge of the Gospel. I prove it from Act. 14. 16. who in times past suffered all Nations to walke in their own wayes. From whence my Argument is this, if God suffered all Nations to walke in their own wayes, then he did not give to all Nations a sufficiency of means for the knowledge of the gospel: But God suffered all Nations to walke in their own wayes.

*M. Goodw.* I deny your major Proposition, and the very next words

words immediately following doe confirme it, *nor hath he left  
not Himself without witness, in that he did good and good remained  
from Heaven, and fruitfull Seasons, filling our hearts with food  
and gladness.* Which clearly shewes, that though our blindness  
for all Nations to walke in their own wayes, yet notwithstanding  
he gave them sufficient means whereby to know him  
and His grace and goodnesse to the World in Jesus Christ. This  
I say is clearly proved in that Verse, for although he suffered  
these Nations to walke in their own wayes, that is, did not deal  
with them as with men under the Gospell, yet he did give them  
so much means to have restrained and reduced them from their  
own wayes as had they been vigilant, and attentive would  
have been sufficient to have recovered themselves out of  
them.

*M. Ames.* Mr. Symonds saith to prove that these things (God  
left not Himself without witness) do not signifi the manifestation  
of the Gospell to the Heathen World, you are to prove that they  
do not import that sense.

*M. Sym.* I prove it thus, if the giving of Raine and fruitfull  
Seasons, be not a sufficient means for the knowledge of the Gospell,  
then your interpretation of the words is not sufficient for  
my Argument. But the giving of Raine and fruitfull Seasons, is  
not a sufficient means for the knowledge of the Gospell, ergo, That  
which the Heathen had was only this witness from God, that  
he gave them Raine and fruitfull Seasons, and this is not a suf-  
ficient means for the knowledge of the Gospell.

*M. Goodwin.* I answer, that to give Raine from Heaven and  
fruitfull Seasons, filling mens hearts with food and gladnesse  
are sufficient to bring men to the knowledge of the Gospell, and  
I give my accompanie of from the words briefly thus, because  
it is said, *That God left not Himself without witness.* Now the  
Nature and Property of all Witnesses (especially on Gods part)  
it is to speak intelligibly and to utter their voice and testimony  
in such a Language that they whom it concerne to hear, and  
are present may understand and perceive; Now the Witness  
which God did not leave himself here without, it was the Wit-  
nesse of His goodnesse to the World, which was by Jesus Christ.

*M. Sym.* I understand your Answer and Reply: if the Word  
Preached



Preached be the only sufficient means for the working of Faith, then men have not a sufficiency of means for believing, who only have Raine and fruitfull Seasons : But the Word Preached is the only sufficient means to work Faith in men; and therefore Raine and fruitfull Seasons are not sufficient. I prove the minor Proposition from that of the Apostle, *Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God Preached*, but Raine and fruitfull Seasons cannot Preach the Word.

*M. Gooden.* You might have spared your Proof till it had been denied. But I answer by distinguishing of that terme sufficiency, and sufficient means, if by *sufficient* means you meane such a means so abundant (as it were,) that men may with the more facility and ease attaine believing, so I grant (in this sence) that the Preaching of the gospell is the only *sufficient* means of believing, but if you meane by a *sufficiency* of means, such a means without which it is impossible that any man should believe. So I deny that the Preaching of the gospell (that is, in that sence wherein I suppose you meane) a verball Preaching of it by men, and that this is the only sufficient means to worke Faith in men, and the Apostle in that Scripture speaks of such a Preaching of the gospell, which is by the *Sun, Moon and Stars*.

*M. Symp.* I would have the Congregation to take notice, and to understand that we are only upon the externall means of Preaching the gospell, and I prove that that is the means of working Faith in men.

*M. Gooden.* That is not the thing denied, but that it is the only sufficient externall means. But if you please we will conclude for the present with this Argument.

*Mr. Ames.* Sir, will you please them to bring that Argument in the last to a close.

(*M. Symp.*) Suppose we might beg so much time as to urge two or three Arguments more.

*M. Gooden.* I am not able in respect of my health, nor otherwise to make any longer stay at this time.

*M. Symp.* Since then you are weary, if you please to give a short Answer to this Argument, that Raine and fruitfull Seasons are not sufficient means, to bring men to the knowledge of the gospell



gospell, we will not be so injurious as to presse you above your bodily strength, my Argument is this, if the Preaching of the Gospell be the only sufficient means received for the making known of the meanes of grace, then Raine and fruitfull Seasons are not sufficient : But the Preaching of the Gospell is the only sufficient means required for the making known of the meanes of grace, and therefore Raine and fruitfull Seasons are not sufficient : I meane Preaching of the gospell is the only externall meanes, I know the Preaching of the spirit is necessary besides it.

Mr. Goodw. By the way Sir, give me leave to Answer a word to that by exprellion of yours, (*externall meanes, &c.*) if so be that that your sence be (as you have partly declared) concerning the inward means of believing, that Faith is wrought by an irresistible hand and power of God, then I say all outward means whatsoever, they are irrelative, and have nothing at all to doe in the work of Faith : But to your Argument I answer, That if by the Preaching of the Gospell you meane a verball Preaching of it by men, then I say it is not the only outward means which God is pleased to use to work Faith in men, or to bring them to believe, but if you meane by the preaching of it, a preaching of it at large, or in any way ; So I grant that the preaching of the gospell is the only absolute necessary, and sufficient means to bring men to believe, but then this I add, that *raine and fruitfull Seasons*, and filling mens hearts with food and gladnesse, these do preach the gospell though not so cleerly, punctually, and distinctly yet as truly as words, or as a verball preaching doth amount unto.

M. Symp. If raine and fruitfull Seasons, doe not hold forth Jesus Christ as a mediator unto men, then they do not preach the gospell : But raine and fruitfull Seasons do not preach Jesus Christ a mediator, *ergo.*

M. Goodw. I deny your minor proposition, and say that these things do declare and hold forth a mediator.

M. Symp. If a man by the booke of the Creature cannot possibly learne this Doctrine, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, or that he came by his Death to make satisfaction for the sin of man, then they do not hold forth Jesus Christ ; But it is impossible for any man by the booke of the Creature to come to the

knowledge of Jesus Christ as one that hath made satisfaction by his death for the sin of man, *ergo*.

M. Goodw. I answer by denying your major proposition, Men may be saved, and means may be sufficient to bring men to believe ( we speak of such a believing which is accepted by God unto Justification, and so unto Salvation ) without the knowledge of all these particularities of the Death of Christ, and I give this reason and accompt of this my answer, because it cannot be proved ( but the contrary ) that the *Jewes* generally, even those that were Believers in those dayes, they had no such distinct knowledge of Jesus Christ being the Son of God, nor of his making satisfaction for the sins of men.

M. Symp. I prove that they had such a knowledge, thus. If they had salvation by Jesus Christ, then they had such a knowledge: but they had salvation by Jesus Christ, *ergo*.

M. Goodw. That is *Idem per Idem*.

Mr. Ames. Sir, I humbly desire of you to declare your sence concerning that place in the *Acts*, for it is conceived that by Gods not leaving Himself without witness, there the Apostle speaks of the naturall capacity of Man, and of that naturall light, which is in him by which he is able to collect a Deity who is to be feared, revered and obeyed; And beyond this same naturall light and knowledge of a Deity, we are not able to conceive how the Sun, Moon, Raine, and fruitfull Seasons speak any thing concerning the mediatorship of Jesus Christ.

M. Goodw. To give a faire Answer to a faire Demand, and reasonable question, I shall willingly doe it. my sence therefore cleerly is this: That the witness of Himself which God is there said not to have left Himself without by the means there expressed it must be not only a witness of his Godhead, as of his power and wisdom for that was sufficiently witnessed unto them otherwise as by the fram of Heaven & Earth, and by the Creation, and Generation of men that were then alive in the World, but the witness which He gave of Himself, or which He left not Himself destitute of, it was of His grace, and goodnesse, and of that inclination which was in Him to shew mercy to men upon their Repentance, that they might thereupon be saved, it did witness or manifest to them, that He had his Armes open to give

give entertainment to them, and to accept of them upon their forsaking of their sins and turning aside from their wayes and workes of unrighteousnesse, now this disposition in God a willingnesse and readinesse of shewing mercy, *interpretatively* and *constructively* it is a Preaching of Jesus Christ unto men, and that upon this account, because that light of Reason in men which God hath given them at least before they quench it, and obscure and bury it under sin, and wickednesse, it hath a sufficiency in it to prove by the means which God vouchsafeth unto them, that there was some kinde of attonement, intercession, or mediation made betweene God and man, otherwise it was not possible that the World should have subsisted under the sinfulness of the creature in that frame, and state, and being, to the comfort of man, had there not been some such Pillar laid to have support it.

*Mr. Ames.* I humbly crave leave to know this; how its possible for us, had not wee lived in an age and place, where we have the Revelation and Manifestation of Jesus Christ, as it is delivered to us in the Bible, the Word of God, by what rule should we proceed to interpret a shower of Raine, or a fruitfull Season into this sense, that Jesus Christ is come to save sinners?

*M. Goodw.* Look after such a manner, or by such a rule of direction, as the Jewes, (especially before the giving of the Law,) and as under the ceremonies of the Law they were able to pick out Jesus Christ and his satisfaction for the saving of the World; by the same rule and meanes may men gather out, (though not particularly) the Name of Jesus Christ (I do not say so) but that which is virtually, and constructively and interpretatively, and for the great end and purpose of Salvation every whit as much as the knowledge of that Name amounts unto; all this I say may be learned from those gracious dispensations of the Providence of God in the World, and my reason is; because the reason of man, and that light of understanding which God hath put into him, it is able to bring him to this point, and to fix him here, that except some means had been used to pacifie God towards the World, it was impossible that a God of that infinite Justice should endure such a World of ungodly ones, such a wicked generation of men as wherewith the whole Earth was



replenished from the one end of it unto the other. This I say is nothing but what in a rationall and faire way may be collected and gathered by those meanes, and by that light of direction, which God hath vouchsafed unto men.

*Mr. Ames.* Sir, I humbly beseech you once more; you are pleased to say, That a reasonable Creature, who never heard of the Revelation of the Gospell ( as we doe ) either by the Ministry of it by Men or by Angels from Heaven, may as well gather out a Mediator interposing between the Creature, and Divine Justice in a shower of Raine, and a fruitfull Season as the Jewes were able to do from a Sacrifice and a Priest.

*Mr. Goodwin.* No, Sir, that was not my Answer; but this I said, as that was a very improbable and unlikely way for men to have gathered out a mediator, especially in those particularities which *Mr. Sympsen* did urge in his Argument. Yet look I say as there was a way and means open to the Jewes hereby to discover *Jesus Christ*, ( though many of them did not finde *Jesus Christ* by that light ) so I say there is a way ( though I doe not say every way equall ) or of the same light and efficacy for the giving out of the knowledge of *Jesus Christ* unto men, as the Jewes we speak of had ) yet it is of the same kinde though a dim, faint, and obscure way and method. And to apply it to the Jewes and to the Gentien, looke as the means vouchsafed unto the one and to the other to discover a Saviour and intercessour, as the meanes was but weak and the light dim and faint, so likewise the acceptance of God ( even of that little which they were in a capacity to collect and gather together by this weak light ) it was prepared and ready for them, and that according to the generall rule of his Providence and Goodnesse, which is this, to accept of Men according to what they have; that is, according to what they have power to doe and performe; and not according to what they have not.

*Mr. Ames.* Sir, I only crave leave to add this further, The different reason between the Ceremonies of the Jewes discovering a Mediator between God and them, and the meanes which you say He vouchsafed to the Gentiles, seems to lie in this; That God was pleased to institute and appoint such Ceremonies and Sacrifices, Temple and Worship, to signifie spirituall things which

were

were to come in the times of the Messiah: And after he had instituted and appointed such things for such an end, he was pleased then to comment and to gloss upon them, and to give the sense of them, which made the interpretation of these things easie unto the Jews. But God not having declared in his Word, that he hath appointed showers and fruitful seasons to be such interpreters of his minds, as to signifie a Mediator, neither having glossed upon them; I humbly desire to know how we may proceed to finde out a Saviour, or to gather such a thing from them.

As for that which you say, That a man, by reason and understanding, may gather much from such showers and fruitful seasons, concerning the inclinable nature in God to shew mercy to a lost creature; I humbly conceive, that the Creature may gather and collect thus much, That the great God, who created the world, is a God of infinite Goodness and forbearance; But that this God hath provided a Mediator to make an atonement between him and man, this I am not able to conceive how showers and fruitful seasons can discover; but he declared in his Word, and will be revealed in his Word.

Mr Symps. There hath been more spoken to this Argument, than at the first was urged; and therefore I conceive we shall best leave it to the Judgment of those who are spiritual, whether they do apprehend it to be according to the Truth of the Word, That showers of rain and fruitful seasons do preach Jesus Christ: For my part, I must profess, that I never learned any thing of Christ to be a Saviour of the World by any such showers.

Mr Goodw. I do not say, That if men be negligent and careless, that these will compel or necessitate any men to believe whether they will or no: If you understand me thus, you argue not to my sense: I say not, That God, by giving rain and fruitful seasons, doth necessitate any man to believe; no nor by the preaching of the Gospel, nor by any inward operation of his Spirit: But this is that which I say, and, had I time, and strength of body, could clearly manifest from the Scripture, and by evident Arguments, yea, and from the testimony of the best Writers, That the Gentiles were in a capacity of coming to such a knowledge of God which was sufficient to save them. I go no further.

Mr Symps. You say, That the Heathen have a sufficient means

for the knowledg of the Gospel: If you please to bring your Arguments for the proof of this, I shall be ready, in the strength of God, to answer them, and to maintain, That the Heathen, who never heard the Gospel, have not a sufficient means for the knowledg of the Gospel. But because you say you are weary, I dare not be so uncivil to press you any further at this time.

Mr Jesse spake to this effect; I desire, because there are many weak Christians here present, that are apt to be troubled, and to despair within themselves, to hear such differences between godly and learned men; they will be ready to say, They know not what to beleeve, nor what Religion to be of: Therefore I shall only desire to inform them this one thing, namely, That the difference between the two Opinions is not so great, but that men, whether they beleve the one, or the other, they may be saved, through the Grace of God in Jesus Christ.

Mr Symson replied thus: Mr Jesse, Mr Jesse, no more of that; for I conceive, that they that hold general Redemption, and Free-will, in opposition to Free-Grace, never had any experimental knowledge of the Grace of God in Jesus Christ.

Mr Jesse: I am sorry to hear such words come from you.

Then Mr Povel prayed, and so the Congregation was dismissed.

**Here ends the second Dispute.**

**THE**





# THE THIRD DISPUTATION

Being between

**M<sup>r</sup> Goodwin and M<sup>r</sup> Sympson, at**

**ALHALLOVVS the great, London,**

**Februar. 11. 1649.**

**M<sup>r</sup> Cranford, } Moderators.  
M<sup>r</sup> Griffith, }**

*The Clark desired silence in the Congregation, and intreated  
the People to sit down: Mr. Sympson and  
Mr. Powel did the like.*

*Mr. Sympson.*

**P**lease you Sir, we will desire Mr. Powel to pray.  
*Mr. Goodwin.* Yes, very well Sir. *Then Mr. Powel prayed.*  
*Mr. Symp.* If you please Sir to make choyce of a Moderator,  
without any Speeches or Prefaces, we will address our selves to the  
Disputation:

Disputation: For Speech will but beget Speech, and, it may be, occasion passion, which may hinder us in our work.

Mr *Gaem*. Very well; I hope I shall be able to moderate my self, or to be moderated by your self, (without any other) in any just and reasonable way: And therefore so far I willingly accept the motion: Onely desire this, That because I found some inconvenience in staying long the last time, (being in years) I shall desire that we may first agree upon certain bounds and limits of time for Disputation.

Mr *Sympf*. We will refer it to what time you shall think fit.

Mr *Goodw*. I shall be willing to stand as long as I am well able; about two hours, or somewhat more; till about twelve a Clock, or a little after: and longer I shall not be well able to stay.

Mr *Sympf*. Whom will you please then to pitch upon for Moderator? I shall leave it to you, because I made choyce the last time.

Mr *Goodw*. I thought your motion had been to have forborn a Moderator; however, I have no exception against any, supposing that they keep within the sphere and compass of a Moderator; which is onely to see and order the Laws of the Dispute; and not at all to intermeddle with the Disputation it self.

Mr *Sympf*. Sir, here is Mr *Ames*, and Mr *Cranford*, if you please to make choyce of one of them.

Mr *Goodw*. I am very willing Mr *Ames* should be; I liked his carriage the last time very well: onely I desire that he should not intermeddle so much with the Question in dispute, as he did the last day. And if you please to joyn him \* with him that was the last time, I shall be willing that they may moderate. I suppose he is not far from you.

Mr *Sympf*. Mr *Ames* desires to wave it: therefore I desire Mr *Cranford* may be the man.

Mr *Goodw*. It is all one to me, onely I expect that as I shall keep my self to the Laws of Dispute (or howsoever shall submit to any lawful correction,) so I expect that the Moderators themselves, be they one or more, should be regular in observing the Laws of Moderators, and not make any digression.

Mr *Sympf*. If you think they go beyond the bounds of Moderators, you have liberty to speak to them.

Mr *Goodw*.

*Mr. Goodwin.* Very well.

*Mr. Simpson.* This is your Question, *Whether the Heathen who want the Ministry of the Gospel, have not sufficient means to believe unto salvation.* I am to answer your Arguments; you affirm, and I deny.

*Mr. Goodwin.* Sir it appertains to me, occupying the place this day of an Opponent, to state the Question in my own sense, according to which I shall be willing to own it, and to plead for it.

*Mr. Simpson.* Sir you should have done it, had we not agreed upon it before: You will have liberty to declare your sense plainly in urging of your arguments.

*Mr. Goodwin.* We agreed upon the terms, but not the stating of the Question. I conceive it tends to a further benefit, both to your self, as unto all here present, for me to give a distinct account of my sense in the Question which I maintain.

*Mr. Simpson.* By no means I shall not grant that, because I had not that liberty my self; if we had agreed upon it to have altered any thing in the Question, I should have done it; I shall not grant you any advantage which I had not my self.

*Mr. Goodwin.* I beseech you thus; do you think that I should have lookt upon it as an advantage to you, or disadvantage unto me, to have given you free liberty to have declared the sense of your Question: it's contrary to all reason, and to the law of Disputation, that any man should lay down his Position, and not be suffered to give forth his sense of the question in dispute.

*Mr. Simpson.* I appeal to the Moderators, if you please let them determine it.

*Mr. Goodwin.* This doth not belong, nor is it any part of the work of a Moderator to determine that which is the known law of all disputes; and without which it is impossible that any disputation should proceed to any good account to the hearers; and except I may be suffered to state my question, and to give an account of my sense, and judgement in it, I conceive I have no ground at all to dispute upon it, and therefore if I may be permitted to do that, I shall be willing to proceed.

L

*Mr. Simp-*



*M. Simpson.* The Congregation is already acquainted with the Question; the former Disputation ended thus: *That raine and fruitfull seasons were sufficient means to preach the Gospell.* And the Question now in hand is, *Whether the Heathens have a sufficiency of means to believe unto salvation?*

*M. Goodwin.* If you will speak while I am speaking, and not give me leave to finish what I have to say, it is in vaine for me to dispute; do but give me leave hertin, and I shall not be streightned toward you in giving you the like liberty, or a greater, if you desire it.

*M. Simpson.* I beseech you expect no more liberty, then what I had of you; we have made choice of Moderators, and I appeal to them in it.

*M. Goodwin.* The thing I desire is not a liberty, but an absolute necessity to the businesse in hand, without which it is impossible that we should proceed; it is to no purpose to dispute, except we first agree upon the state of the Question, and explaine the sense of it, which is so reasonable, that I wonder any man of ingenuity should make any stick at it.

*M. Simpson.* I desire not to have any advantage at all in disputing, neither will I give you any; I desire not to have my own will, but to refer it to the Moderators, whether it be reasonable for you to speak largely to the Question, when I had not that liberty granted unto me.

*M. Goodwin.* We have not chosen Moderators to do any thing, or to determine any thing against the lawes of Disputation, but only to observe and oversee the laws thereof.

*M. Simpson.* I conceive it unreasonable that you should have that liberty to state your Question at large, when I had it not granted unto me.

*M. Goodwin.* I wonder Sir, that you will offer to open your mouth in a thing so manifestly untrue: For what was there spoken by me, or any man with me, that did offer to stint, restrain, or prohibit you in that kind? I appeal to all the company, whether there was any one word from me, or from any other to that purpose.

*M. Simpson.* I desire the Moderator to speak: I conceive it an unreasonable thing for my Opponent to have more liberty then

then I had ; and therefore I refer it to you to determine, and if you agree to it, then I shall take the same liberty.

*M. Goodwin.* In what should I refer my self ? To make the Question now before us (when there is so great company of people met together for their edification) to have it managed so, as that there should be no possibility of a right understanding of it, and so no probability of any benefit by it.

*M. Simpson.* I conceive the people very well understand the Question, and I desire you so far to shew your self ingenuous, as having chosen Moderators, to refer your self to them : if you do not look upon them as rationall and honest men, why did you make choice of them ?

*M. Goodwin.* I wil refer my selfe to the judgement, that is, to the reasons which the Moderators shall please to give against my sense in the Question, and if they shall give better reason why I should not declare my sense in it, then I can why I should, I shall yeeld to them.

*M. Simpson.* But who shall judge ?

*M. Goodwin.* They shall give their Reasons, and I will give mine, and we will not determine it, but leave it to the people.

*M. Simpson.* Leave it to the Moderators to judge, if they conceive your Reasons stronger for you, then mine are for me, I will submit.

*M. Goodwin.* If that be their sense, and they shall give reasons on that hand, that is, why I ought not to declare the state of the Question in my sense, then I shall be willing only to compare my Reasons with theirs, and so let them (and whosoever will) judge between us.

*M. Simpson.* Sir, I have two Reasons against it : First, I conceive that you ought to have no more liberty as Opponent then I had, and I had not this liberty granted me.

*M. Goodwin.* That's an absolute untruth ; for I beseech you, who did restrain you from this liberty ? Speak to it, speak home, if you will approve your self for a Christian, who laid these bands of restraint upon you ?

*M. Simpson.* I took it for granted, that I might not have the liberty, and therefore did but state my Question. My se-

cond reason why you ought not to have this liberty is this; Here is a great Congregation, and (for my part) I am perswaded in my conscience, as in the presence of the Lord, that it is an error which you hold forth, and I do not hold it fit that where there are so many weak ones, that you should have liberty to hold forth those things which are erroneous, unless there be some to answer you in those Scriptures which you bring, and the reasons that you alledge: This is that which lies upon my conscience, why I cannot admit the thing you desire.

*M. Goodwin.* As to that point, I answer thus: That if you desire to be the man your selfe that will give answer or reply to my declaration of my sense in the Question, or rather put it into the hands of the Moderators, one or both, I am freely content to allow liberty and full scope, and as much time as you will desire for the doing of it. But again, another reason which I think will outweigh yours, and that by many degrees, for the declaring of my sense, is this; namely, that by some words that fell from you the last day, (as that I did hold forth free will in opposition to free grace,) I desire to declare to all the people here present, that you do utterly and absolutely mistake and misunderstand my sense and judgment in these Questions: For I profess here before God, Angels and men, and all this company gathered together, that I hold nothing at all, neither free will, nor any other opinion whatsoever in the least in opposition to free grace: And I know it with the knowledge of assurance, that whensoever your opinion and mine shall be brought into a clear light, and truly compared, yours will be found the great exalters of free-will, and the great abaser of free-grace. And the account thereof is this, because-- [*Here M. Simpson interrupted him, and spake thus:*]

*M. Simpson.* I thinke I shall never meet with any man that holds free-will, that will say, he maintains it in opposition to free-grace: But by something delivered then in that Disputation, (which I doubt not to make evident in some other Dispute,) you then held forth free-will to the opposing, if not to the overthrowing of free-grace, I mean as it is held forth in the Gospell of the Lord Jesus.

*M. Goodwin.*



*M. Goodwin.* Sir, there are some hundreds of persons here present, who have been constant hearers of my Doctrine in these controversies, and many of them have heard my judgement both in publike and private: And I appeal to them all, *conjunctim & divisim*, whether ever they heard any word fall from me, either in publike or in private, which did any wayes tend to the exaltation or magnifying of free-will in man, or to the depressing, abasing, and destroying of the free grace of God.

*M. Simpson.* Sir, but that I am unwilling to disturb the Disputation, I could by severall arguments make it evident, that you overthrow the eternall election of Gods free grace, that you have laid the salvation of man upon the creatures believing, and not upon the free grace of God, electing; and this overthrowes free-grace, and sets up free-will; but I desire to omit this at present, and shall refer it to another opportunity to dispute it with you, and in the mean time intreat you to keep to the business in hand, having agreed upon the Question.

*M. Goodwin.* This I say, I conceive the Declaration of my sense in the Question may be of better consequence, and tend to a better issue, and edification of all that are present, then the Dispute it self may do: And my Reason is this, because I suppose that when I shall have delivered my sense in it, possibly it may tend to a reconciliation of the opinions, and I shall be found to hold nothing in so great an opposition to you, as you conceive I do, but that your sense and mine may unanimously agree; and I conceive that such an issue and fruit as this, will answer every way, to any benefit whatsoever that may otherwayes accrue unto the people.

*M. Simpson.* You have said what you can, and I shall be willing to refer it to the Moderators.

*M. Goodwin.* I shall be willing to hear what they have to say to the business.

*Mr. Cranford.* Sir, for the quieting of this difference betweene you, Mr. Griffith and I have considered it together, and we conceive it very sutable to the Law of Disputes, that the Question be stated before you dispute: But we conceive, that it belongs to the Respondent to state the Question in what

what sense he holds it, and in what sense he denies it: And when he hath made his Thesis, declaring in what sense he holds or denies, then it's lawfull for you to make your Antithesis, and to declare what you allow of in the Position, and what you disallow.

M. Goodwin. I think there is reason in what you say; onely then there is none in what he said before: he complained of want of liberty to state his Question, when it was never deni'd him.

M. Griff. *It belongs to the Respondent to state the Question.*

M. Goodwin. When the sense of the Opinion is declared, it will be either the same that I shall own and subscribe to, or otherwise. If it fall crosse in any thing unto mine, then the occasion and liberty is devolved upon me of course and equity, to declare my sense.

M. Cranford. *Yes surely.*

M. Simpson. Mr. Moderator, what conceive you to be reasonable in this thing? I did not come hither to make my *suppositum* (as they call it in the Schools) I know it lies upon the Respondent to state the Question, and therefore he needs not to contend for it.

Then the  
Question was  
written, and  
delivered to  
them.

M. Cranford. *If you please to give us the Question in writing, that we may have it in our hands before us.*

M. Simpson. This is the Question, *Whether the Heathen who want the ministry of the Gospell, have not sufficiency of means to believe unto salvation.*

M. Goodwin. Very well, I own the terms, if you please to expresse your sense of it; and in particular touching what sufficiency of means you understand: and the reason of my desire to hear your sense in that point, is, because there is a double sufficiency of means to do a thing: First, *Immediate*, and *Conjunct*: Secondly, *Remote*, or *Mediate*; Now by an immediate or conjunct sufficiency, I mean the possession of such means by which a man is immediately enabled without doing any thing more, or obtaining any thing more then what he hath at present to perform the thing: As for example, in case a man doth understand a language perfectly, as the *French*, & withall hath his sense perfect of hearing, such a man hath an immediate sufficiency to understand the mind

of

of him, that shall speak to him in that language, and needs nothing more then what he hath already, the knowledge of the tongue and his sense of hearing perfectly. But now by a remote and mediate sufficiency, I mean such a sufficiency by which a man is not able presently and immediately to performe the thing, but yet he is able to doe such things, or to compasse such farther means, by which he shall possesse himselfe of an immediate capacity to doe it: As for example, though we have not a sufficiency of meanes at present, to speake or to understand him that speakes in an unknowne tongue, (*Spanish*, or the like) yet we have a remote sufficiency in this kind, that is, principles of reason and understanding, by a regular improvement whereof, (as by study, &c.) we may come to have such an immediate sufficiency. Now my sense of the question in hand is touching this latter sufficiency of means, I do not mean that the Gentiles, or any other, have any present or immediate sufficiency of means to believe, originally given to them by God, but that they have a remote sufficiency, that is, such a sufficiency of meanes; by the use whereof they may possesse themselves of such farther meanes, by which they shall be immediately inabled to believe. This for that. Again, for those words, *the Ministry of the Gospell*; I would onely put in these words, [ *by men* ] For I confesse there is no sufficiency of meanes for a man to believe; but by the Ministry of the Gospell: But now as for such a Ministry of the Gospell (which I suppose you intend) as an orall, or verball Ministry of it by men, so I say, there may be a sufficiency of meanes for men to believe without the preaching of the Gospell, *viz.* by any declaration or manifestation of the truth and substance of the Gospell, whether by men, or words, or what means els soever.

*Mr. Simpson.* Sir, I desire to have liberty to speak a few words (though I did not intend it.)

*M. Goodwin.* You need not desire liberty to speak.

*M. Simpson.* Sir, I do find three sorts of men, who do write concerning this Question.

The first is *Socinus*, and some others, who do hold that Heathens by the light of nature, have sufficient means to believe un-



to salvation: And he holds it upon this account, because he conceives that God in justice is bound to give eternall life unto that man that walks up unto the principles of nature that are in him. Now in this sense I deny a sufficiency of means from the light of nature: First, because God hath not promised to lapsed man a sufficiency of means to him that walks according to the light of nature. Secondly, I deny it upon this account, because no man ever yet did walk according to those principles, as the Apostle doth plainly prove it in the first and second chapter of the Romans.

The second sort that I have met withall, they conceive that Heathens have not a sufficiency of means, *proximè*, but *remotè*, which is the same with you: that they have it not immediately or neerly, but onely remotely; and the principle upon which they go is this, that *facienti quod in se est, Deus non potest denegare gratiam*: If a man do that which in him lies according to the principles of nature, God cannot deny grace to that man. But I deny this, and say, that walking according to the principles of the light of nature in any measure, doth not ingage God to give the light of supernaturall grace unto men, for the salvation of their soules. And I find that many learned *Iesuites* maintain this point in this sense, that the Heathens have a sufficiency of means to believe unto salvation, remotely: and upon this they bring their *meritum ex congruo*; they say that a man doth not by the merit of congruity deserve supernaturall grace, by walking according to the principles of nature: but this they say, that it is congruous to the bonity, and goodnesse, and mercy of God, to be mercifull to those Heathens who walk up in some measure to those principles of nature which God hath given them.

The third sort, are those, who apprehend that the light of nature is sufficient in it self for the apprehending of supernaturall truths: And I likewise deny a sufficiency of meanes unto the Heathens to believe to salvation in this sense. So that you see plainly what my sense is: I deny that the Heathens, either in a remote or immediate sense have a sufficiency of means either externall or internall to believe unto salvation. And thus in short, you have my thoughts concerning the present Question.

M. Goodwin.

*Mr. Goodwin.* I hope now the offence is taken out of the way, and you have had your liberty to speak your mind; and since there was dirt raked out of the kennel, and thrown into my face, I hope that you will not forbid water to wash it off: Sir, you pleaded that you could not give the right hand of fellowship unto a person that held free-will. Now I must professe here before God, Angells, and men, and unto you, that I hold no manner of free-will (if you take the word as the sound, and the Gammar of it carries it) in opposition in the least unto free grace: and I am confident, that when your opinion and mine shall be brought together, and duely compared, yours will be found the great exaltresse of free-will in men, and the great abaser of free-grace; for my Opinion is clearly this; -----

[*Here Mr. Goodwin was interrupted with this answer.*]

*Mr. Simpson.* I know your opinion very well, this is not to the purpose; another time if you please, we will have a disputation upon this point, whether free-will in your sense or mine, overthrows free-grace.

*Mr. Goodwin.* I beseech you give me leave to speak, and if I be blame-worthy, I will lie under all that reproach that you throw upon me, but if innocent, there is no reason that the truth of God, or my selfe, should lie under prejudice in the minds and judgements of men: I desire nothing, no manner of advantage; but onely to render my selfe *Rectus in Curia*, Right in the Court, and free from prejudice, as far as my judgement and opinion will free me in the apprehensions of men.

*Mr. Simpson.* It is but your affirmation, and my negation, and that will not do it; let the next thing we go upon, if you will, be this, Whether free-will in your sense or mine, overthrows the free-grace of God in the Gospell.

*Mr. Goodwin.* VVhatsoever I shall propound or argue in the case before us, (if I shall lie under this prejudice which you have throwne upon me, in the minds and judgements of the hearers) Alas, I shall speake every word unto losse and disadvantage, as to the weight and importance of it.

*Mr. Griffeth.* The Question being stated, you holding that  
M the

the Heathens have not an immediate sufficiency, but remote ; If you please to propound your arguments, the Respondent will receive them.

*Mr. Goodwin.* Presently I will do it, if this be your sense, that (having had dirt throwne into my face) I should not have liberty to wash it off.

*Mr. Simpson.* Let me urge my arguments against free-will.

*Mr. Goodwin.* VVhat will you do that, when you understand my opinion therein, no more then the man that is now walking in *S. Peters Church* in Rome?

*Mr. Cranford.* Pray good Sir no more.

*Mr. Griffeth.* The Question being stated and agreed upon, which is this, VVhether the Heathens, who want the Ministry of the Gospell by men, have sufficiency of means to believe unto salvation: I pray go on to the proof of it.

*Mr. Goodwin.* Very well, since it can be no better, we shall be willing to doe it. And first then, that the Heathens even without the verball Ministry of the Gospell, have a sufficiency of means to believe unto salvation, and so to be saved: I argue from the *1 Tim. 2. 4.* Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the acknowledgement of the truth: From whence I argue thus;

If God will have all men to be saved and come to the acknowledgement of the truth, then have all men (and so the Heathens; one or other) sufficient means to be saved, and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth.

But the will of God is to have all men saved, and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth.

Therefore the Heathen also have sufficient means to be saved, and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth.

*Mr. Simpson.* I can either deny the sequell of your Major Proposition, or can answer to your second, or Minor Proposition by distinguishing.

*Mr. Goodwin.* You have your liberty, and therefore make your choice.

*Mr. Simpson.* I answer therefore rather unto the Minor Proposition, thus; That there is a twofold will in God, there is a decretive will, which is irresistible; and a preceptive will of



of God in his Word: it is not *decretive* will of God, that all men should be saved, but it is his *preceptive* and revealed will in the means of grace which he doth afford unto men, that all men should believe unto salvation. And in the next place, this Argument doth not at all reach the thing which we have in hand; for the Apostle doth speak of those who enjoy the Ministry of the Gospel; and all that can be concluded from it (if we should put your sense upon it) is this, that it is the will of God that all men should be saved, who do enjoy the means of grace; but Heathens (according to us) do not enjoy the means of grace, and therefore this Argument doth not reach the businesse in hand.

*M. Goodwin.* If you would please to betake your self to one steddy answer, I should know the better how to proceed; but by your multiplying answers, you clearly argue that there is no sufficiency in any one of them: And therefore you make a pile of answers, that so you may be thought to answer something to purpose.

*M. Simpson.* My answer is plaine, I tell you in what sense God wills that all men should be saved, and in what sense he wills that they should not be saved: And now if you please, proceed against this distinction, I say that God by his *decretive* will doth not will the salvation of all men, but by his *preceptive* will, where he affords the means of salvation to a people, there his revealed will is, that all that believe shall be saved by Jesus Christ. And I beseech you proceed against this distinction.

*M. Goodwin.* What against the *decretive* and *preceptive* will?

*M. Simpson.* There is a fallacy in your Argument.

*M. Goodwin.* Then there is a fallacy in the Apostles.

*M. Simpson.* I distinguished between a twofold will of God, a *decretive* and a *preceptive* will.

*M. Goodwin.* It is a signe you are jealous of your distinction, because you repeat it so often.

*M. Simpson.* My answer is plaine, that the meanest of the Congregation may understand it, and I appeale to the Moderators, which is this, that God doth not will the salvation of all men by his *decretive* will, but by his *preceptive* will, he

reveals it that all that will believe should be saved; so that I say, there is a twofold will in God, a *decretive* and a *preceptive* will.

M. Goodwin. By that superfluity of words that you come with in the rear of your Answer, I alwayes forget the sense and substance of it.

M. Cranford. *This is M. Simpson's Answer, that the Text speaks of the preceptive will of God which concerns only those men, who live within the Pale of the Church, and not at all concerning his decretive will.*

M. Goodwin. If this Text of Scripture speaks of all men without exception, then it doth not speak only of those which are within the pale of the Church, but the Text speaks of all men without exception; therefore it doth not speak only of those who are within the pale of the Church.

M. Simpson. I deny your *minor* Proposition.

M. Goodwin. I prove it thus: If so be the exigency of the context, and the scope of the place doth evidently require it, and inforce it, that it should be understood of all men without exception, and not determinately of those within the Church, then it is so to be meant: But the scope and context of the place (being that which must open and determine the sense of the words) doth necessarily and clearly shew that it is to be understood of all men without exception; and therefore it is not to be limited to those that are within the Church.

M. Simpson. I deny your *minor* Proposition; or if you please, I will give you a distinction: I grant, that the Apostle in these words doth acknowledge an universality of all men; but here I distinguish *all men*, that is, either first all men, of all sorts, qualities and conditions, rich and poore, high and low: Or secondly, all men without exception of any, all men in the world. I grant an universality in the first sense, that it is the will of God, that all men, that is, that men of all sorts and conditions should be saved by Jesus Christ; but that it is not according to the *decretive* will of God, that all men without exception should be saved: And this I conceive to be the plaine meaning of the Text, and the ground and reason why hee would

would have us pray for all men.

M. Cranford. M. Simpson, you should give him leave to speake.

M. Goodwin. Sir, if you please, go on where you was, and prove that the scope of the Context doth require it to be understood of all men, and not of all sorts and ranks of men only.

M. Goodwin. I prove it thus: If so be a limited sense of all sorts and ranks of men, will render the Apostle in this discourse of his incongruous, defective, and indeed ridiculous, then the other sense, namely, the generall and universall, which respects all men without exception, is that which is here meant. But the limited sense determining it to all ranks and sorts of men onely, this makes the Apostle weak, defective, and ridiculous in his Context and discourse; and therefore it is the other sense that is to be taken.

Mr. Simpson. I deny the sequell of your major Proposition.

M. Griffith. How Sir, what the sequell of the major?

M. Powell. No Sir, he denies the minor.

M. Goodwin. Then I prove it that the limited sense makes the Apostle weake, and defective in his Argument, thus: Evident it is from the Context, that the Apostle in these two Verses, the third and fourth, doth deliver a motive or Argument to presse his exhortation delivered in the two former Verses. This is cleare from this illative or rationative particle [for:] *I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for Kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life, in all godlinesse and honesty. [For] this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have, &c.*

Now there is nothing more pregnant and evident then that there is a motive delivered in these two Verses, to presse the exhortation delivered in the two former: Now then I say, if so be we shall take this phrase, *all men*, here in this motive to the Exhortation, in a limited sense, it makes the sense of the motive to be directly opposite to the exhortation, and not any way conducing to the pressing and



and urging of it, and that I demonstrate thus.

*Moderator.* I pray draw up your sense into a short syllogisme.

*M. Goodwin.* For matter of context it will not readily come into a syllogisme, but we will try what may be done. Thus then I prove it, that that sense will make the Apostle ridiculous in his argument.

If so be such a sense, which will make the motive incongruous, incoherent, nay opposite unto that very end for which it is brought, will render the Apostle ridiculous; then such a sense we speak of (a limited sense) will render him ridiculous.

But to bring a motive which is quite contrary and opposite to the exhortation which it is brought to promote and presse; this makes the Apostle (or whosoever doth it) ridiculous, defective, and weak in his argument.

Therefore this is contrary to the Apostles meaning.

*Mr. Griffith.* *M. Simpson* be pleased to repeat *Mr. Goodwins* argument.

*M. Simpson.* I will give it you in a shorter syllogism: That which makes the motive incongruous, doth make the Apostle ridiculous; but this sense makes the motive incongruous, and therefore it makes the Apostle ridiculous. Now I deny your *minor* Proposition, and say that it doth not make the motive incongruous.

*M. Goodwin.* If so be the sense of the Apostles exhortation in the two former verses be generall, that he would have Christians to pray, and make intercessions for all men without exception. Then to bring this as a reason that God will have some to be saved, and not all, it is to make the motive incongruous to the exhortation, and consequently the Apostle ridiculous in his argument.

*M. Cranford.* The Argument is this, that the Apostles motive is as large as his exhortation, and that his exhortation is meant of all men.

*M. Simpson.* I answer to this, I must have liberty to open the text.

*M. Goodwin.*

*M. Good.* Very good, you MUST have it, though I MIGHT not have it upon intreaty.

*M. Cranford.* Mr. Simpson, you should give answer presently by repeating the syllogisme, and then denying the Major, or Minor.

*M. Simpson.* I beseech you Sir repeat your argument, for to my apprehension, it was not according to forme and figure.

*M. Goodwin.* You see the substance, and I beleve the power of it, which makes you contend against the form and figure of it: it is this, if the Apostles exhortation was to have all men without exception prayed for, then his motive to his exhortation must be this, that God would have all men without exception to be saved: But the Apostles exhortation, the tenor of it is to have all men without exception prayed for, and not only all sorts, degrees, and kinds of men, and therefore requisite it is, that the motive should be understood of all men: for the motive must be as large, and commensurable with the exhortation: and consequently if all in the one must be understood of all men without exception, then must it be so understood in the other.

*M. Simpson.* You do not dispute according to order, nor reason; you are to bring in the Proposition denied in the syllogisme, which is not.

*M. Cranford.* It is in, and the syllogisme is very good, which is this: That which makes the reason shorter then the exhortation, makes the Apostles argument ridiculous: but this limited interpretation doth so: Ergo.

*Mr. Simpson.* I deny the Minor Proposition.

*M. Goodwin.* I prove it thus; That the Apostle in his exhortation unto Christians to pray for all men; by all men he doth mean all men without exception; not *genere singulorum*, but *singulari generum*: not all kinds of men, but all particulars in every kind. This I prove from the second verse; if so be the Apostle doth here injoyne and exhort, that prayers be made for all particulars of one sort of men: and there can be no reason given, why prayers should not be made for all particulars.

culars of any sort of men, then it is an evident case that he doth exhort that Prayers be made for all particulars of every sort of men: But evident it is, that the Apostle exhorts that prayers be made for all particulars in one rank or sort of men: Therefore certaine it is, that Prayers should bee made for all particulars in every sort or kinde of men.

*M. Simpson.* I will repeat your Argument, and put it into form thus; If the Apostle in his Exhortation would have all men to be saved, [*M. Cranford, No, all the particulars in one kind*] then he commands that prayers be made for every particular of all sorts; but God would have all men to be saved of one kind: *Ergo.*

*M. Goodwin.* You destroy the power and substance of it with your forme.

*M. Cranford.* *M. Goodwin's Argument is this, If the Apostle exhorts that Prayers should bee made for every particular in one kind or sort of men; and there can bee no reason given why prayers should not be made for every particular of all sorts; then it is plaine, that he exhorts that prayers should be made for all particulars in every sort and kind of men; but it is evident, that he exhorts that prayers be made for all particulars of one sort of men: Ergo.*

*M. Simpson.* I answer by denying your *minor Proposition*, and say, that the Apostle doth not will us to pray for all particular men in the world without exception, that they may be saved, there are a people for whom Christ prayed not.

*M. Goodwin.* You deny something that your self say, but nothing of what I say.

*M. Griffeth.* *The minor is this, that the Apostle exhorts that Prayers be made for all particulars in one sort or kind of men.*

*M. Simpson.* I say, that every particular person without exception is not to be prayed for, there are a people in the world that are not to be prayed for.

*M. Goodwin.* That is not to the businesse.

*M. Griffeth.*



*M. Grif.* If every particular in one sort of men should be prayed for, then every particular of every sort of men ought to be prayed for: but every particular in one sort of men are to be prayed for: Ergo, This is *M. Goodwins* argument, if you please deny the Minor.

*M. Simpson.* I deny your Minor Proposition.

*M. Goodwin.* I prove it clearly from the second verse; For Kings, and for all that are in authority. From hence I gather that, If Christians ought to pray (as in the Apostles exhortation) for all without exception, that are in authority; then he commands that prayers be made for all particular persons in one rank or order of men; and that too of such a rank and order which the Christians then might have thought of all other ranks of men should not have been prayed for, because they were the greatest enemies in those dayes unto the Christian Faith. And that's the reason why he doth specify, and instance especially in them: to shew that he would have all men without exception, (as well the greatest enemies of the Church, as those that may seeme more friendly to them,) prayed for.

*M. Simpson.* Your argument is this: If the Apostle would have us to pray for all men that are in authority without exception; then it is his will that we should pray for all men of all sorts. I deny the Minor Proposition: it is not the will of God that we pray for all that sort; that is, for their salvation: we may pray for those who are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life under them: But absolutely to pray for the salvation of their soules, that I deny.

*M. Good.* I prove that the Apostles exhortation is, that we should pray for all, even for their salvation, and that first from your own principle; which saith, that it is the preceptive will of God that all men should be saved. If it be the Apostles minde that the preceptive will of God should take place: then it is his minde, that the salvation of all that are in authority should be prayed for. But it is the mind of the Apostle, and the will of Christ himselfe, that the preceptive will of God should take place, and be prayed for, to be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Therefore certain it is, that the meaning of the Apostle is, that the salvation of all that are in authority should be prayed for.

And besides, it is evident from the motives thus, *who will have all men to be saved*; which is the very reason, why he enjoynes, and

and requires prayer for these men; because he will have all men to be saved; Therefore the intent of the Apostle is, that prayers should be made for all men, for their salvation.

*M. Simpson.* Thus you reason, you say you will prove it from our own principle, that if it be the preceptive will of God, that all men should be saved; then it is according to the will of God that we should pray for the salvation of all men: But (say you) according to our own principle, it is the preceptive will of God that all men should be saved. *Ergo*, To this I answer, that there is praying for men two manner of wayes; First absolutely; Secondly, conditionally. We are not to pray absolutely for the salvation of all men, not knowing whether God intended to damn them, or to save them: But we are to pray for all men conditionally, that is, if they be such for whom Christ died, and belong to the election of grace: In this sence we are to pray for the salvation of all men, yet with submission to the will of God in the thing.

*M. Good.* I argue against that distinction, that the will of God is, that we pray for all men, not absolutely, but conditionally. If so be that the will of God be, and the Apostles intent is, that we should pray for all men conditionally: Then Gods will is onely conditionall, that all men should be saved. But Gods will is not conditionall, (for it is exprest here, *who will have all men to be saved.*) And therefore for you to distinguish and make that conditional, which the Apostle makes absolute. And for you to determine that men should do that conditionally, which God hath commanded simply, positively, & absolutely, without any condition: In this case you are not an interpreter, but a maker of new Scriptures: and you put your own sence upon the word of God.

*M. Simpson.* I beseech you Sir, speak nothing against me, but prove what you can. I say, that it is not the will of God, that the Saints should pray for all men.

*M. Good.* That which God commands to be done absolutely, (namely, without any manner of condition) that is to be done absolutely, and without condition: But God commands that all men in authority should be prayed for, without any condition or limitation: And therefore it is the will of God that all those should be prayed for simply and absolutely.

*M. Simpson.* I deny the second Proposition: It is not the will of God that we should pray absolutely, for the salvation of all men and women in the world without exception; Christ did

not pray so : and we are to pray in faith : but we cannot have faith to believe that God will save all men. Nay, it is contrary to the Scripture, therefore we are not to pray for all men.

*Mr. Good.* If so be that the Apostle here injoyne prayers to be made for all men, without the mention of any condition in this kind ; and no such condition can be proved from any other Scripture : Then we are to follow the expressness of the Letter, and not to reſtraine, ſtifle, and quench the ſpirit of his meaning by any limitation, or diſtinction of our own: for that doth amount to a making of new Scriptures.

*Mr. Simp.* It belongs to you Sir not to ſpeak ſo much : The propoſition which you are to prove is, that the Apoſtle injoyne all men to be prayed for without any limitation.

*Mr. Good.* The propoſition is, that the Apoſtle injoyne all men in Authority to be prayed for, and this proves that by all in the motive to this Argument, muſt be meant all men without exception : For *all men* in the exhortation, and *all men* in the motive to it, muſt be of one and the ſame extent.

*Mr. Simp.* There is a plain exception againſt this, for we gave this diſtinction before; that by all, is not meant all without exception, but all ſorts.

*Mr. Good.* I have clearly proved the contrary.

*Mr. Griſ.* I conceive *Mr. Goodwin* hath brought in his proof to ſhew.

*Mr. Simp.* I tell you by all, is meant all ſorts of People.

*Mr. Good.* There is not a jot or tittle of answer in what you ſay.

*Mr. Simp.* The diſtinction I made uſe of is this, That it is not the mind of God, that all men without exception ſhould come to the knowledge of the truth, but ſome of all ſorts of men. And likewise that it is not the will and mind of God, that we ſhould pray abſolutely for the converſion and ſalvation of all men, but onely for the ſalvation of thoſe that are elected, whom God did intend to ſave by *Jeſus Chriſt*, from all eternity. Now if you have any thing more to ſay, ſpeak.

*Mr. Good.* You have answered nothing to the purpoſe, for here the words of the Text are, *For Kings, and for [all] that are in Authority* : Now whether here be any reſtraint or limitation put upon the prayers of Chriſtians for all thoſe that are in Authority, I leave to judge.



*Mr. Simp.* I can prove that by all in Scripture, is meant all of such a quality, such a state and condition: And I say so it is taken here: And the Apostle doth plainly hint it forth, when he speaks of these particulars, for he doth not speak of all particular men without exception; but men of such a sort and condition: so that if you have any plain Argument to overthrow this distinction, we shall be willing to heare it. Otherwise it is but *Petitio principii*, A begging the Question, and not proving of it.

*Mr. Good.* No Sir, the Scripture is plain, and it hath been proved, that by all men in the 4<sup>th</sup>. verse, must of necessity be understood, *all* without exception. The Argument to prove it was, because the exhortation in the 1. verse, is to have *all men* prayed for: And to prove what these *men* were, the second verse holds forth, *viz.* That he would have all particulars of one sort, and rank of men to be prayed for; and consequently if all of one sort, then all of every sort: And therefore by *all men* in the former verse, must be meant all men without exception: The process of this discourse is so clear, pregnant and regular, that men of ingenuity cannot but own it.

*Mr. Cranf.* I beseech you consider, your first Argument was this, that the Gentiles have sufficient meanes remote of coming to faith, and by faith to salvation: your Text to prove it was this: God would have all men to be saved, &c. *Mr. Simp.* your distinction is this, that all men signifies onely all sorts of men, that are within the sound of the Gospel: your disproofe of this was from the Apostles context, that all men must signifie every particular man: your reason was, because every particular man was to be prayed for: To prove that, you cite the second verse, because all Kings were to be prayed for, and every particular of that sort: Now *Mr. Simpson* doth deny the consequence; that though every particular King, and all in Authority should be prayed for; yet it will not follow from thence, that every particular man in the world should be prayed for.

*Mr. Good.* If *Mr. Simpson* will own that Argument, we will answer to it.

*Mr. Simp.* I answer, that it is the will of God that we should pray for Kings, and all that are in Authority, that they may rule well; but it is not the will of God, that we should pray absolutely for their salvation.

*Mr.*

*Mr. Good.* That's not the question, but whether we may pray at all for their salvation. If you will take away my Argument, you must either prove that all of one sort are not to be prayed for: Or if so, that yet notwithstanding, all of another sort are not to be prayed for.

*Mr. Simp.* My answer is this, which I will stand by, that the Apostle here doth not mean all men without exception; but all sorts of men: And I conceive that it is not the mind of God, nor of the Apostle, that we should pray for all particular Kings, for their salvation, now if you can disprove this answer, and overthrow it. I shall grant you the *Question*.

*Mr. Good.* I proved that it is the mind of the Apostle, that all Kings, and all that are in Authority should be prayed for. As to the matter of salvation, I beseech you consider, that is nothing at all to the Argument. For what is to be proved is, that all that are in Authority are to be prayed for, whether conditionally or not, that is not the business, but that they are to be prayed for. And if that be granted (which is the expresse and undeniable letter of the words, and cannot be avoided.) Then it doth evidently follow, that by all men in the 4th. verse, must of necessity be understood all men without exception: otherwise the motive will be incommensurable, and narrower then the exhortation.

*Mr. Cranf.* I beseech you Mr. Goodwin consider it, there are two things which Mr. Simpson desires to be proved: The first is concerning the objects to be prayed for: you cite, all Kings, and all that are in Authority: He saith, not all Kings, but onely those that are within the noife of the Gospel, under which there are Christians: That these Christians may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. Secondly, he saith further, not for their salvation, but that under them we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, &c.

*Mr. Good.* If Mr. Simpson will stand to this answer, let him but own it, and we will answer it.

*Mr. Simp.* I stand to my own answer, which is this, That the motive is answerable to the precept: The precept is for the praying for all men; The motive is that it is the mind of God, that all sorts of people should come to the knowledge of the truth.

*Mr. Good.* Though that be nothing to the Argument, yet I will go along with you; for the Argument is clearly founded upon the express words of the second verse, which are, *For Kings, and all that are in Authority*, and not onely for those that are in the Church, and under the sound of the Gospel.

*Mr. Simp.* Your consequence cannot be proved, for we say the motive is answerable to the precept.

*Mr. Good.* The consequence is proved to my hand, by the Holy Ghost himself; who expressly here affirm's, that he would have all men, not all sorts of men only: he doth not say that he would have all sorts of Magistrates that are in Authority; but all Magistrates to be prayed for: And you come in with words, and turn the Scripture up-side-down, and quite destroy the life and power of the Apostles meaning.

*Mr. Simp.* I say that the Apostle doth not mean all men; but all sorts of men.

*Mr. Good.* Your answer is not to purpose; but I must go along with you, in your wild chase. If the Apostles exhortation be this, that he would have all sorts of men to be prayed for; then his meaning is, that he would have them prayed for, either as corporations and rankes, and species of men; or else as they are orders of men, consisting of so many particulars and individuals: but his sense and meaning, neither is that he would have them prayed for, as they are communities of men, nor yet as they are particular men in every calling: therefore his mind and meaning is not, that he would have all sorts and rankes of men onely to be prayed for.

*Mr. Simp.* I answer to your minor proposition, it is the will of God that we should pray for all sorts of men, look upon them in corporations, and look upon them as particular persons: It is the mind of God I say, that we pray for all particular men, of all sorts, qualities, rankes and conditions, not knowing who shall be saved, and who shall be damned.

*Mr. Good.* Very well then, you and I are agreed; for this is all that I say, that all sorts and particulars of men ought to be prayed for in order to salvation: Now you are come home to my sense; and I hope we shall have a good issue of the business in the conclusion.



*Mr. Simp.* Consider it I beseech you, you put in the word *salvation* now, it was not in your syllogisme, for it was deny'd, that we are to pray for all of all sorts: I told you we are not to pray for their salvation, absolutely, but conditionally.

*M. Good.* That is not to the busines whether conditionally or absolutely, but whether we are to pray for them that they may be saved or no.

*M. Simp.* We are to pray for all men indefinitely, not defining which particular person shall be saved, and which nor, and so we are to pray for all men without exception.

*M. Good.* Very well, that is all that I say; for my meaning is not that men should go about to learn the names of all men, & so to pray for every one by name: But that we should pray for all men in the world in a generall and comprehensive manner.

*M. Cranford.* Under favour, that is not to pray for all men indefinitely, but Universally, & singularly which *M. Simpson* denies.

*M. Good.* I beseech you Sir, keepe to the place of a Moderator: You know there is no difference betweene *indefinite* and *universal* in a necessary proposition, but they are equivalent; therefore the duty of prayer being necessary, herein to do a thing indefinitely, and to do it universally is one and the same.

*Ad. Simp.* I deny that. It is one thing to pray for all men indefinitely, and another thing to pray for all men universally: We are to pray for all men indefinitely, that is, all sorts of men, not defining these and these particular persons, as set apart for salvation; but we are not to pray for all men and women universally excluding none.

*M. Grif.* I pray speake to that Proposition: prove that all are to be prayed for, without excluding any.

*M. Good.* I prove that we are to pray for all, excluding none: If so be that all are to be prayed for, whom God hath not excluded from our prayers: Then all simply, indefinitely, and universally, are to be prayed for; but all whom God hath not excluded from our prayers, are to be prayed for, *Ergo*.

*Mr. Simp.* I deny the Major Proposition, there are some excluded the prayer of *Jesus Christ*, and consequently they are excluded the prayers of all the Saints. And besides, it is contrary to Scripture, 1 *John* 5. 16. For such a man I do not say you should pray.

*Mr.*

*M. Good.* This I prove, that your answer is clearly beside the sence of the Scripture, and nothing to purpose as to my argument.

*M. Simp.* Prove that we are to pray for all men and women in the world without exception.

*M. Good.* This is my sence in that proposition, namely, that all men as they are men and before they put themselves into an incapacity of being prayed for; so all men I say are to be prayed for, & you bring a Scripture to prove that some men, that have put themselves out of a capacity of being prayed for; are not to be prayed for. I do not say that all men in any condition, after any degree of sinning whatsoever (as for example, the sinne against the Holy Ghost) that such men as these ought to be prayed for: But I say that all men considered simply as men are to be prayed for.

*M. Simp.* These are words which you bring in now: not before mentioned: your proposition is universall without exception, that all men are to be prayed for: And I give a clear Scripture where we are commanded not to pray for some, and therefore your Argument is false.

*M. Good.* My argument is not false because I did not intend, nor did I say that all men in [ any condition ] were to be prayed for, but as they come into the world: I told you in what sence I affirme it: And the reason why I did not distinguish and limit it; was because I did not thinke any man would be so irrationall as to conceive that I did include those that sin against the Holy Ghost: I thought you had had more understanding.

*M. Simp.* The thing that you have indeavoured to prove is, that the Apostle in that place of *Timothy*, exhorts that prayers should be made for all men in generall; but we prove, that that cannot be the sence, because it is contrary to another Apostle, as in this place of *John*.

*M. Good.* Nay I tell you, it is not contrary to that Scripture though it should be taken in such a sence, because those very persons who are there excluded by reason of that sin: The very same persons before the committing thereof, were capable of prayers; and consequently all men are to be prayed for: yea these men themselves are not excepted in reference to their persons, but in referenee to their finnes.

*Mr. Simp.* The thing which you have indeavoured to prove, (though not able) was that the Apostle in these words did intend that all men without exception were to be prayed for: But by what we bring from *John*, it is plain that all cannot be taken in that sence.

*M. Good.* That in *John* is nothing to the purpose, and I prove it thus: The committing of the sinne against the Holy Ghost, doth not multiply persons in the World: doth not make more soules to be in the world then there were: And I say that all persons, even these, before they had sinned that sinne, they were included in the Apostles. [all.] And you cannot prove that any Person in the world then had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost: and if you could, yet this was not to the purpose; for even these very persons, before they had committed that sinne, were persons to be prayed for, and consequently all.

*M. Simp.* I shewed there was a positive Command, that we should not pray for some men: therefore what *Mr. Goodwin* saith, cannot be according to the mind of the Holy Ghost. I beseech you speak something, that we may not spend all our time upon one Scripture; but if you please, let us proceed to another.

*M. Good.* Now you take upon you the place of a Moderator.

*M. Simp.* Sir, I consider the People, and I think it very unprofitable for the Hearers, to insist so long upon one Scripture.

*M. Good.* I conceive it most profitable, for as the light of the Sun is more profitable then the light of all the Stars, so one Scripture where the truth is evident, pregnant, and cleare, may be of more concernment to the people, and more edifying to them then many.

*M. Simp.* Sir, you are not able to overthrow the distinction that we have given; but we have overthrowne your Argument.

*M. Good.* I that you have, just as you have overthrowne the Apostles. And I trust that those who are present, and desire they do consider and see how things are carried. And for my part, I



shall be willing to leave those things which have been argued, to their judgements and Consciences.

*M. Simp.* I conceive they will, and I know they will not say, that all men in the world are to be prayed for; when the Apostle saith expressly, that some particular men are not to be prayed for.

*M. Good.* This is that which I say, that mens committing the unpardonable sin, doth not multiply persons in the world; but these very men, before they had committed that sin, were to be prayed for.

*Mr. Cranf.* Sir, you have waded in this Argument, I conceive, as farre as your Argument will drive from this Scripture. The substance of all is this: you contend that every singular man in the world is to be prayed for; at least under this notion of a man, quatenus homo. *Mr. Simpson* he peremptorily denies this Proposition: he cites one Text of Scripture, which is, 1 John 5. There is a sinne unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it. You say, that that sinne doth not multiply persons, but states: and that a man, as a man, was to have been prayed for, before such time as he sinned that sinne. He objects and sayes, that Jesus Christ knew a sort of men, as men, that were not to be prayed for. But I conceive so farre as I am able to understand, that you are both gone from the main question you began with; which was, whether God had given sufficient meanes of faith and salvation unto those Gentiles, to whom he had not given the Gospel?

*M. Good.* We have proceeded in this question, by direct methods hitherto.

*M. Cranf.* Sir, if it please you to leave this, and to urge another Argument.

*M. Good.* All this while I say, I have prosecuted the question, in a very straight and direct line. I proved that the Heathens have sufficient meanes of salvation, because the will of God is that all men should be saved, and come to the acknowledgement of the truth: And Heathens being in the number of men, it is the will of God, that they also should be saved, as well as others.

*Mr. Simp.* Sir, If you please to proceed to another Argument, we shall heare you, bring your Arguments to prove, that rain and fruitful seasons, are sufficient meanes to preach the Gospel.

Mr

*M. Good.* I have proved that the will of God is that all men should be saved, &c. The motive would not be commensurable to the exhortation.

*M. Grif.* It's desired that you address your self to a new Argument.

*M. Good.* Very well, I shall be willing to do it. All those for whom Christ gave himself a ranfome, have sufficient meanes to believe unto salvation: But Christ gave himself a ranfome for the Heathens, (as well for those who have not the Ministry of the Gospel by men, as those who have.) And therefore these Heathens as well as others, have sufficient meanes of salvation.

*Mr. Goodwins 2d. Argument.*

*M. Simp.* Sir, I deny your minor Proposition; but withall, must give you notice, that you are going from the question; which is, whether God hath afforded sufficient meanes, by the light of nature, and the works of Creation for the Heathen to believe unto salvation, and you run upon another question, whether or no *Jesus Christ* died for all?

*M. Good.* Sir, I bring this for the proof of it, and will you deny me my *mediums*, and appoint me by what Arguments I shall proceed?

*M. Simp.* You have not made good your promise to the Congregation; which was to prove that rain and fruitfull seasons do preach *Jesus Christ*.

*M. Good.* That is not the business, but the question is, whether the Heathen without the preaching of the Gospel by men, have sufficient meanes of salvation, and I prove they have, because Christ died for them.

*M. Simp.* Our question is about an external meanes; for you said that the works of creation were a sufficient means to discover Christ: it is not about the meritorious meanes, as of the death of Christ; but about the external which God hath given to discover Christ.

*M. Cranf.* That is *Mr. Goodwins Argument* because they have the meritorious cause of salvation, therefore they have the external cause and meanes of salvation also.

*M. Simp.* I deny the minor Proposition.

*M. Good.* I prove it thus. Either Christ gave himself for the

Heathen (who want the Ministry of the Gospel) as well as for others: Or else he put a difference between these Heathen and others, in laying down the ranfome of himself: But he did not put a difference between Heathen and Heathen; or men, and men, in laying down his life; and giving himself a ranfome: therefore he gave himself a ranfome as well for the one as for the other.

M. *Simp.* I deny this Proposition, and say, that *Jesus Christ* did not die for those Heathens, who never enjoy'd the Ministry of the Gospel.

M. *Good.* If so be *Christ* made no difference between men and men, (they that have the Ministry of the Gospel, and they that have it not,) in laying down his life, then he did as well give himself a ranfome for those that have not the Gospel, as for those that have. But *Christ* made no difference between men and men, in laying down his life: Therefore he did as well lay it down for those that have not the ministry of the Gospel, as for those that have it.

M. *Simp.* The minor Proposition is denied.

M. *Good.* Then I will prove it.

M. *Cranf.* If it please you, (though I desire not to interpose any thing; nor to do any thing contrary to that office and trust which is reposed in me as moderator) yet I beseech you Sir, a little to consider the expectation of the People, and the end for which they are come together: which is not in generall to have it wrangled out, whether the Heathen have meanes of salvation or no; but what that meanes of salvation is, which the Heathen enjoy without the preaching of the Gospell.

Mr. *Good.* Now you start a new question, which differs as much from ours, as the *East* is from the *West*: Our question as it was agreed upon on both sides, was, whether the Heathen without the ministry of the Gospel, have sufficient meanes to believe unto salvation.

M. *Simp.* You come not to the thing you promised, the last meeting: which was to prove, that raine and fruitfull seasons do preach the Gospel.

Mr. *Good.* Was there not a question stated and agreed upon? did not you give your fence of it, and I mine? and yet now will you



you find fault, and take offence that I answer not to another question, which is essentially and notoriously different from it? For it is not material *what* meanes they have, but whether they have *sufficient* meanes or no.

*M. Simp.* It is material, for this hath relation to our former Disputation.

*M. Cranf.* *Under favour, this I conceive is the question in hand, whether the Heathen, who want the ministry of the Gospel, have sufficient meanes unto salvation: This question according to your own sence, as you stated it. First, by the ministry of the Gospel, you understand onely a Declaration by words: There might be other meanes besides this ministry of the Gospel by men, which the Heathen might enjoy: And Secondly, By sufficient meanes to believe to salvation; you stated sufficiency, proxime & remote, neere and remote, mediate and immediate: And you assert that the Heathen have such meanes, (which though they were not proxime yet remote, that is, by doing some act or thing which they had a power to do, those meanes might be made effectual for their salvation: Now I conceive you have varied the state of the question, for you now go upon the meritorious cause of salvation, that Jesus Christ died for the Heathen promiscuously.*

*Mr. Good.* I do not make the least digression, or variation from the question in that sence wherein I hold and state it. My sence was, that the Heathens have sufficient meanes for salvation: I did not determine or prescribe, neither is there any thing in the words of the question to bear it; how, or what kind of meanes they have; for it may be very hard to determine and prescribe that: but this is that which I undertake to prove, that a sufficiency of meanes, they have vouchsafed unto them by God for that end.

*Mr. Simp.* Sir, if you will prove that *raine and fruitfull seasons are sufficient to preach the Gospel, doe*; for till this be done, you frustrate the expectation of the Congregation.

*Mr. Cranf.* *I desire that the Disputation may proceed, you onely maintain then in the generall, that the Heathen have sufficient meanes to believe; but what that sufficient meanes is, you do not know, neither will you undertake to determine.*

*Mr.*

*Mr. Good.* No, I will not undertake it in this Dispute.

*Mr. Simp.* Sir, you are to prove, *that raine and fruitfull seasons are sufficient meanes to preach the Gospel.*

*Mr. Good.* If so be, that that had been the state of the question agreed upon, I would have argued to that: But since we have another on foot, and that agreed upon, and consented to on both sides, I desire to keep to that.

*Mr. Cranf.* Then *Mr. Simpson*, you are only to answer to this, *that Christ died for all men.*

*Mr. Simp.* If you please to wave your former question and therein to falsifie that ingagement which lies upon you to prove, *that the workes of Creation (Raine and Fruitfull seasons) are sufficient meanes, whereby to understand the Gospel,* we are willing to follow you in another.

*Mr. Good.* Sir, The ingagement that lies upon me to prove is, *that the Heathen have sufficient meanes to believe unto salvation:* And if you will take the argument it is thus. If so be that Jesus Christ, gave him selfe a ransom for those Heathens, who have not the Ministry of the Gospel, as well as for those that have; then as well the one as the other have sufficient meanes unto salvation: But Christ gave him selfe a rancome for those who have not the Ministry of the Gospell, as well as for those that have, *Ergo.*

*Mr. Simp.* The minor Proposition is denied.

*Mr. Good.* I prove it thus. If so be that Christ did not give him selfe a rancome for those who want the Gospel, as well as for those that have it: then he put a difference between men and men, in giving him selfe a rancome; But he did not put a difference between men and men, in giving himself a rancome: And therefore he gave himself a rancome, as well for those who want the ministry of the Gospel, as for those that have it: And consequently, vouchsafes a sufficiency of meanes, as well to the one as to the other.

*Mr. Simp.* We deny the Minor againe.

*Mr. Good.* I prove it thus. If so be that Christ did put a difference between men and men, in giving him selfe a rancome; then this difference was put by him, according to the will & pleasure of God the Father: But the will and pleasure of God the Father



Father was not, that Christ should put any difference between men and men, in giving himselfe a ranfome: *Ergo.*

*Mr. Simp.* I deny the Minor.

*Mr. Good.* If so be that it was the will of God that Jesus Christ should put a difference between men and men in giving himselfe a ranfome, then this will of his was either taken up, and conceived by him at that very instant of time when Christ did give himselfe for a ranfome, or some time before, or from Eternity. But such a will in God that Christ should put a difference between men & men, in giving himselfe a ranfome was neither conceived in him at that time when he did give him self a ranfom, nor befor, nor from eternity: Therefore there was no such will in God, that such a difference should be made.

*Mr. Simp.* I answer, that there was such a will in God from Eternity.

*Mr. Good.* If there was no reprobation of persons, according to the will of God, from eternity: then there could be no will in God, that Christ should put a difference between men and men, in dying for them: But certain it is, that there was no reprobation of persons from eternity: therefore there was no such will in God from eternity.

*Mr. Simp.* I deny the minor Proposition, and say, that there was a reprobation of particular persons from eternity.

*Mr. Good.* If so be there were no persons of men from eternity, then there could be no persons of men reprobated from eternity: But there were no persons of men from eternity: Therefore there could be no reprobation of particular persons, from eternity.

*Mr. Simp.* I answer by distinguishing thus, persons are said to be either in respect of their own being in the world; or else as they are in *decreto divino*, the divine decree: We say that persons were not in being as we are now upon earth: But they had a being in the divine decree of God, and foreknowledge of the Almighty.

*Mr. Good.* If so be persons as they were in that decree of God, were not capable of being reprobated; then notwithstanding such a being, they were not reprobated from eternity: But per-

sons



sons considered, as in the decree of God; were not capable of being reprobated, *Ergo*.

*Mr. Simp.* I deny your Proposition, they may be reprobated, as persons having a being in the decree, and foreknowledge of God.

*Mr. Good.* I prove it thus: If so be the decrees of God, are nothing else but God himself, infinite: And men as they had a being from eternity, it was nothing else, nor no other being, but God himself: Then if they should be reprobated from eternity, it must be God himself that must be reprobated.

*Mr. Simp.* I am ashamed to repeat your Argument.

*Mr. Good.* Sir, I suppose it, because you are not able to answer it, nor all the men on earth, nor Angels in Heaven for you.

*Mr. Cranf.* Under favour Sir, this argument which you bring, hath not that strength, nor weight in it, which you lay upon it.

*Mr. Good.* Let him answer it then.

*Mr. Cranf.* You see Sir, how the People relish it, I beseech you speak more modestly of God.

*Mr. Good.* I only shew you the absurdity of his opinion; and indeed the blasphemy of it; for this doth directly follow upon it: There was no being from eternity but God himself, all the beings that were were onely God; and therefore if you say, that there was a reprobation of persons from eternity, it must be the reprobation of God himself; which is the most horrid and blasphemous consequence of your opinion.

*Mr. Cranf.* Sir, I pray you, had not all things a futurition, in respect of the decree of God? and is there no distinction in his decree, in respect of voluntas, and voluntatis; the decree of God, as it had respect to the will of his decree, is one thing; and as it had respect to the Decree of his Will is another. Take it in this latter sense, and it doth produce another thing out of nothing.

*Mr. Good.* Sir, you disparage Mr. Simpson.

*Mr. Simp.* I tell you that things may have a being in the will of God, which have not a being among the Creatures: As in 2. Rom. it is said that God calls things that are not, as if they were.

Mr.

Mr Goodw. I say, All things had a Being in God from Eternity; but not such a Being wherein any of them were capable of Reprobation under that Being.

Mr Symps. Yes, they had such a Being in that Decree of God, that some of them might be elected, and others reprobated.

Mr Goodw. That I denyed; and my reason was this, It so be that there was no man that had a Being from Eternity, no creature but God himself, and all the Being which they had were in God; then if any of them were reprobated, it must be as they were in God, and consequently God himself: or else you must say that there was something from Eternity that had a Being besides God, and distinct from him.

Mr Symps. You have an Answer, That creatures had a Being in the Decree of God, and they were fore-seen by him: God fore-sees that such a one shall be born before he is born; and yet Gods fore-seeing that such a thing shall be is not God: And this is my Answer.

Mr Goodw. It is so, such as it is: For herein you go against the received Principles of all Divines and learned men whatsoever; and against that known rule in Logick, *Quicquid est in Deo, Deus est*: Whatsoever is in God, is God.

Mr Cranford. I beseech you Sir, do not so charge Mr Symps for going against the Opinion of all Divines: I am sure you are acquainted with Coraelius of Amsterdam, who hath written a large Treatise upon this very Subject; That *Decreta Dei non sunt Deus*: The Decrees of God are not God.

Mr Goodw. The Question is not what one particular man doth hold, whether of a contrary Judgment or no; but whether hereby we shall not turn up by the roots, and cut the sinews of all received Principles, to make way for a particular mans opinion.

Mr Symps. No such matter; Election and Reprobation is not the opinion of a particular man: You have not proved any thing to the contrary.

Mr Goodw. Then let me prove it.

Mr Symps. We say, Gods fore-knowledg is God, but the Objects of his fore-knowledg are not God.

Mr Goodw. This is that which I say, Either there was something from Eternity besides God, or else there was nothing: If nothing,

then there was nothing to be reprobated: If something, it must be God himself: which I shall stand too; and let all the world answer it.

Mr *Sympf.* We distinguish thus, between Gods fore-knowing of a thing, and the Object of his fore-knowledge: We say, The Decree and foreknowledge of God is God himself: But the Object of his Decree is not God himself.

Mr *Goodw.* This I say, Whatsoever had any manner of Being from Eternity, co-equal with God, this was (and could be nothing but) God himself; or else we must say, that there was some *created Being* which did partake of that incommunicable attribute of God, which we call *Eternity*: But impossible it is, that there should be any created Being that could partake of this incommunicable attribute of God: Therefore there was no manner of Being from Eternity but God himself; and consequently there was nothing capable of Reprobation, except we shall say that God should reprobate himself.

Mr *Sympf.* Here is nothing but *Petitis principii*, The begging of my Question.

Mr *Goodw.* No Sir, It is the *commanding* of my Question, not the *begging* of yours.

Mr *Sympf.* To your Argument I answer: Things may be in God as God himself; and so we say, That *Quicquid est in Deo, Deus est*; Whatsoever is in God is God: And so the Decree of God is God, and the fore-knowledge of God is God: But there are likewise Objects of this Decree and fore-knowledge of his, and we say, that these Objects may have a Being in the Divine Decree, and yet may not be God. As for instance; If we shall conceive that God fore-sees any particular thing, must we therefore hold, That that thing which is fore-seen by him must needs be God?

Mr *Goodw.* Therefore I say, If so be there was any thing in God (Objects, or whatsoever else) from Eternity that was not God himself, then there were some creatures from Eternity: But there were no creatures from Eternity: Therefore there was nothing but God himself.

Mr *Sympf.* I must here come in with the same Answer again, because your Argument is the same: There were creatures, though not actually existing, and in Being, yet in the Divine Decree:

For



For still you run in a circle; and here is nothing but *Idem per Idem*.

Mr Goodwin. I grant, That all men were in God, as in the productive cause; otherwise, if they had not been in him so, it was impossible that ever they should have had any Being at all: They were in God, as the Rose in Winter is in the root of the tree: Now we cannot say, some of the Roses flourish, and some of them are withered, whilst they have no other Being then what they have in the root. So, though all men are in God from Eternity, yet we cannot say there was any difference in them then; for if there should, the difference must be in the Nature and Being of God himself.

Mr Cranf. Pray will you please to consider this, for the satisfaction of the Congregation: I think it is concluded among you all, That God knew all his Works from the beginning; and why might not God from eternity dispose of his creatures, to whom he would give Being in time, as you or I may dispose of a house, which we intend to build in time. Mr Symonds opinion is, That God appointed times and seasons from eternity; and before such time as he gave creatures their Being, he disposed of them what he would do with them: And this Decree, and Fore-knowledge, and Determination of God, as it respects and reflects inwardly upon God, as it is Actus eminentis, it is God himself; but as it is determined upon the creature, so it is transient, and not God.

Mr Goodwin. We grant, That all things had a true and real Being in God, and that from eternity; and that it was free for God to make what Laws and Decrees he pleased in himself, for the disposing of these creatures of his when they should come forth into actual and material Being: But this is that we say further, That though God did decree from eternity concerning the disposition of such and such creatures of his; yet he did not then actually dispose of them: Now Election and Reprobation do not import the Decrees of Election and Reprobation; but they respect the execution and acting of that Decree it self.

Mr Cranf. Then, if you please, Sir, put your Syllogism into these terms, That there could be no revocation of this Decree from eternity.

Mr Symps. If you speak till to morrow morning, I shall keep

the Proposition in mind which you are to prove; namely, *That things which are not actually existent cannot have a Being in the Divine Decree*: I can prove, *That things which are not in actual Being had yet a Being in God*: *Jeremy was made a Prophet by the Decree of God before he was formed in the womb*; which shews, that there is a difference between the Object of Gods Decree, and God himself.

Mr Goodw. Stand to that then, *That there is a distinction and difference between God himself, and the Decrees of God*.

Mr Griffith. Mr Symphon, keep to this, *That there is a difference between the Object of Gods Decree, and God himself*; as *Jeremy, before he had a Being, he was the Object of Gods Decree, but not God*.

Mr Goodw. This is the thing which I grant, *There is a difference (some kind of difference indeed) between God, and the Decrees of God*; yet really, and substantially, they are but one and the same: And though there be a difference herein, yet notwithstanding it is not such, as that the Objects of these Decrees, as they were in God, should be capable of Election or Reprobation.

Mr Grant. You are fallen upon a Question, which (I confess) if it was in the Schools, only among Schollars, it might perhaps deserve some ventilation, about the pre-existence of things in the knowledge of God: You know the large Treatises written upon this Subject by Schoolmen: But I verily believe, that if you argue upon this Subject till to morrow morning, the people will not be able to understand you, whilst you dispute upon these Metaphysical Notions.

Mr Goodw. The Argument which I have urged against Reprobation from Eternity, I conceive it is so clear and obvious, and lies so near the understanding and capacity of the weakest who are present, that there is none of them all but may fully and clearly apprehend it, namely this, *That it is impossible there should be any thing reprobated from eternity that was not*: And again, *That there was nothing from eternity but God himself*.

Mr Symp. I conceive there is none here so irrational, but can easily distinguish between the Decree of God, and the Object of that Decree: You are to prove, *That the Object of Gods Decree is God himself*.

Mr

*M. Goodw.* If by Object you meane any thing that was from eternity, I have proved it already, if you meane any thing else, it is not to the point: I am to prove that there was no Reprobation from Eternity. Now if there was no Object from Eternity, then there could bee no such Act from Eternity.

But the time is past, and I have spent my selfe, and fear that I have incurr'd some inconvenience in my health: yet notwithstanding, I have been freely willing to give testimony to the Truth of the Lord Jesus Christ: which will be witnessed at the great Day of His appearing: And till then, I shall be willing to lie under what reproach either you, or whosoever else, shall cast upon me. I have stood up here as you see, and denied my self many wayes in the things; and shall now refer both my cause and yours to the righteous judgement of God: who we are sure cannot be deceived.

*Mr. Cranf.* Sir, you was pleased to signifie unto the People, that your Argument lies so neare to their understanding, that there are none here present but are capable of it, and can carry it away: namely, that there can be no Decree of Reprobation from Eternity, because there was no Object of Reprobation, only God Himself: which is as much as to say, I cannot determine what I will doe with any Worke, which I purpose to make hereafter, because that Worke is not yet in being. Take Election and Reprobation for the Decree of God, how He will dispose of such Creatures, when they shall have a being, this might be from Eternity, though the Creatures themselves had not then an actual being: But if you take Election and Reprobation, (as you seeme to binde) for the execution of this Decree in time, none opposes: For, known unto God of old are all His Workes. And therefore if the People understand the Argument, they understand no more but this, that GOD could not execute His Decrees, but in Time.

*M. Goodw.* I fully accord, and close with you in this; and desire the People to take knowledge of it, that there is no Election or Reprobation from Eternity; but Decrees of Election and Reprobation only: which I fully and freely assent unto, and am of the same judgement with you herein: I say there is no



Reprobation of persons from Eternity, because it is impossible there should be any persons from Eternity: But the Decrees of God being nothing else but God Himself, therefore to deny such Decrees from Eternity, is to deny God Himself. But this is that which I deny, that these Decrees respect persons personally considered: but they only respect Species of men; As for example, The Decree of Election from Eternity was, *that who-so-ever believes should be saved*: and on the contrary *that who-ever lives and dies in unbelief should be condemned*; this is the Decree of Reprobation: And this is that which I say that there is no other Decree of Election and Reprobation from Eternity, but only this: And so I have done.

Mr. Syme. There is a Proposition which lies upon you to prove, namely, that the Object of Gods Decree, and his Decree it self are the same: If you have any Ability therefore in you, either prove it because you make it such an invincible Argument, or else go off as you did the last time, not able to make good what you say: For you have not answered your promise, which was to prove that the Workes of Creation were a sufficient means to hold forth the Gospel: I as Respondent shall look to my duty, and if you will hear me, I shall be willing to doe it.

M. Goodwin. To prove any thing to them that are incapable of proof, I am not able to do it: I am I confesse more conquered with your weaknesse then with your strength.

M. Powell. I desire leave to speake a few words, and so we shall conclude: The ground and occasion of the first Dispute with Master Goodwin, it was some difference between Master Goodwin's People and others: And the end of it was for Reconciliation, not for Contention. When we came together, the first Question was concerning Universal Redemption: where M. Goodwin did assert this Position, *that Christ did die intentionally on His Fathers part, and on His own, to save all the Posterity of Adam*: Mr. Goodwin was opponent, and he urged this Argument, *that if God did love all, then he did intend the Salvation of all, by the Death of Jesus Christ*. There was an Answer then given unto that Scripture which he then urged,

3 John. But I passe from thence, and come to the second Disputation; which lay upon Mr. Sympsen to prove the contrary; that *Christ did not die on His Fathers part, nor on His own part for the Salvation of all Men intentionally.* M. Sympsen urged severall Arguments against that Position; and this for one, that if God did intend the Salvation of all Men, by the Death of Christ, then He did intend to give sufficient meanes unto all men for their Salvation: Now the Result of that Dispute was this, that when Mr. Sympsen came to urge a Scripture in *Acts 14. That the Heathen were left without the Gospell, and that they had but showers and fruitfull Seasons, to discover a God unto them.* Mr. Goodwin was pleased to say thus; that he would undertake to prove, that such showers and fruitfull Seasons, did discover a Mediator; which he undertaking to doe; Truly it made me very earnest, and desirous, to heare how he could do it; Because I am going into a darke Country, where there is want of the Gospell; and if he could have told or informed me how the *Sun, Moone, and Starres* teach the Gospell, I should be very glad to have heard it: But I take notice of this, that now Mr. Goodwin, instead of proving that; he states his question another way: And so M. Sympsen takes it as he states it. Now the dispute this day (contrary to our expectation) wherein Mr. Goodwin undertaking to prove, that God hath given sufficient meanes unto the Heathen for their Salvation, he hath urged it by two Arguments: The first was from, *1 Tim. 2.4. Where the Apostle saith; who will have all Men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the Truth.* Now M. Sympsen denied that Argument with this distinction, that there is a Decree and a Preceptive, Will in God: There was something else concerning the Word, *[all]* and *Praying for all*: Now I shall desire to take notice of two things; first, that M. Sympsen might have denied the sequell of the major Proposition, which was that the Apostle commands them to *Pray for those that are in Authority, &c.* and therefore it must follow that they must Pray for all others: For the Apostle gives the Reason why they should Pray for all that are in Authority; that they might lead a peaceable, and quiet life under them.



The second Argument which *Mr. Goodwin* urged was this: If Jesus Christ gave Himself a Ransome for all, then He gave the meanes of Salvation to all: But He gave Himself a Ransome for all, *ergo*. Now there is *salacia dicti* there; for the Word all, is well known to be taken for all sorts; and sometimes for a great number, and not for all men: As in *Luke 21. Hebrews 2. He Died for all*, that is for all sorts of men. I have but two words more to speak.

First, I desire you to consider this, how *Mr. Goodwin* hath run Himself, (although a good Saylor,) and lost his Ship in the Sands,

And secondly, consider withall how he doth deny his own saying, which he acknowledged the last time, namely that there were Decrees in God from Eternity; and that He said that Decrees did respect states of men from Eternity, and not perticular Persons.

Thirdly, I desire you to take notice of a good Observation, that *Mr. Goodwin* hath in one of his Bookes, namely, that one error leads unto many others, and hath many kindred. As a man that marries a Wife, hath many Kindred that relate to him by meanes thereof: So *Mr. Goodwin* houlding this error, many other errors, Cosen Germain to it, will come in, and follow upon it, which he must maintaine. And I desire to speake only this as the sum of what I have to say, and I shall finish it in two words; to desire the Congregation, first, to examine those Scriptures which have been urged on either side; and so to desire the Lord to give them His Spirit, to helpe them to the right understanding thereof: And secondly, that this Congregation would consider that *M. Goodwin* is singular in his Opinion (for any thing I know) in distinguishing between the Decrees of God, and the Object of His Decrees; for there are many Ancient and moderne Writers against him. Thirdly, I desire you to consider this, that these Positions of his, which may seem to cary a great stroke in the World; they are no new things; for many others before him, have urged them with as much strength of Argument, as *Mr. Goodwin* (though very able) can doe.

And



And lastly I desire this, that if so be the Lord hath been pleased to perswade you, either this time or the last, that hereafter you would not suffer, either Satan, or his instruments to draw you aside from the ancient and pure Gospel, which teaches Jesus Christ unto you. For I professe if that be truth, that the Sun, Moon, and Starrs do preach a Mediator; I professe that both I and many more are to learn Jesus Christ from them; and I might appeal to M. Goodwin himself, whether he hath ever learned a Mediator from them or no.

M. Goodwin. You have taken liberty to speake your mind in folio: and among others, that contradiction of yours is evident, in saying that I was singular in my opinion, when immediately in the next words, you add, that I said nothing but what was said of old, and what other men use to say: And here I add, that all that I hold in these controversies about the death of Christ, and the extent of it, and the power of believing given unto men, and so of other matters, as of personall Election and Salvation, they are nothing but what were held generally by the Churches of Christ for the first 300. years next after Christ: and there were none of your opinion then heard of, or acknowledged in the world: and Calvin speaking about election upon foreseene faith, in his 23. chap. of 3. book of his Institutions, Sect. 1. he saith, that the time of this opinion, which was for the first 300. yeares after Christ (which according to the sense of all Divines, were the purest times of the Church) and wherein there were the least inroads, and incroachments made by errors upon saving truths, the great truths of the Gospel. There was no noise in the least of any such opinion, by those that were accounted Orthodox in those daies. And this is acknowledged (upon the matter) by all our late learned writers, to this very day; it is known unto all those that have but a little knowledge in books, that all the Reformed Protestants, that are of that way called Lutherans (who are not inferiour to those that follow Calvin; neither for number, nor learning, nor parts, nor zeal) all these generally (it may be some few, no considerable number excepted) they all stand up for that opinion which I now hold, may, even the Ministers themselves among us, that are here in the City, and they that plead so fiercely against this opinion, I may say as the Roman Oratour said concerning





'whoſoever believes on me, he ſhall be pardoned and ſaved? This word whoſoever comprehends all, and excludes none; therefore object not againſt your ſelves, neither reſuſe your owne ſalvation.

'Object. Oh! but though Chriſt invites all, and makes promiſes to all that do come, yet he intends not that all ſhould be made partakers thereof.

'Anſw. My beloved, Think you that Chriſts intentions, and his expreſſions are not one as reall as another? I tell you (and you may believe it) that he intends to pardon all, and to ſave all, as he expreſſeth it: He ſaith not the words only, but his heart is ſo alſo. But mark it well, and miſtake me not, I do not mean that he ſaith abſolutely, I'll pardon all, and ſave all, and no more: Oh, no; but he ſpeaks conditionally, I'll pardon you all, and ſave you all, if you believe on me, and accept of my pardon.

M. Powell. Go on Sir, go on, read all, baulk not the condition, there is that which followes that clears it, read all or none.

M. Goodwin. A ſecond inſtance which I would read unto you is out of a ſmall Treatiſe, publiſhed by moſt of the Miniſters in the City (two and fifty in number) out of a pretence to give teſtimony to the truth of Jeſus Chriſt againſt errors and hereſies: Pag. 32. *Thousands and ten thouſands of poore ſouls, which Chriſt hath ransomed with his blood, ſhall hereby be betrayed, ſold, and endangered to be undone to all eternity.* Firſt, here is the Doctrine of univerſall Redemption fully aſſerted; in as much as they that are ransomed by the blood of Chriſt, are ſaid to be in danger of being undone to all eternity: For danger implies not a poſſibility only, but a probability and likelihood of falling into, and ſuffering what they are in danger of: Now if the ransomed of Chriſt may be in danger of periſhing, then the ransomed are not the elect only in your ſenſe, but they that periſh, and conſequently, all men. I could bring you twenty other inſtances beſides theſe, which do aſſert, preach, and affirm (and that conſtantly from day to day) the very ſelf ſame Opinions and Concluſions which now they quarrell with, and make ſuch matter of Errour and Hereſie of, and things of ſuch a



dangerous nature; I say, they cannot preach without them, nor write without them.

M. Cranford. Concerning these questions that have been disputed; you all hear the Arguments that have been brought; and how they have been answered; I add nothing to that. M. Goodwin hath told you, that all the Churches and Teachers of the Churches, for the first 300. years after Christ, taught no other Doctrine but what he teaches concerning Election, Redemption, Universal Grace, and such like. Now here I make this Proposition unto him, let him but name one Father within 300. years after Christ that taught all these Doctrines; and I will yeeld the truth of the Argument; Eusebius in the fourth Book of the Ecclesiasticall Story, speaking of the death of Polycarpus, tells us this story, that the Jewes did intreat the Governour, that they might have the body of Polycarpus, lest the people should turne away from following of Christ to worship him: These are the words of the whole Church of Smyrna, for (saith he) they were ignorant, that we could not turne from Christ, not that died for all the world, but onely for all those that were saved out of the world. This was the Doctrine then preached, it would be too long to go over all particulars; so from yd building, thus it is to be proved.

Secondly, whereas he cites that all the Lutherans were of his Opinion, who were as many, and as learned and zealous as others; I say againe, let him take upon the writings of Hotinius against Huburnus, (who was much of his Opinion) and specially of Sopi-nius, a briefe catalogue and consent of the Lutheran Divines, and I believe that Mr. Goodwin, or any others who can examine these booke, they will be of another mind. And for that which he cites out of Mr. Powell, he is able to answer for himselfe; but this I discern, that he skipt that which would give light to all the businesse, (though he did earnestly intreat him that it might be read.)---

M. Goodwin. Sir, I cannot beare you in this: I did not skip one word.

M. Cranford. For that passage which he cites out of a book written by the Ministers of the City of London, in their testimony against Errors and Heresies; I confesse my hand is to it: I say M. Goodwin makes a very ill use of that, to think that it conduces any way to his opinion:

opinion: It's true we say this, that there may be a danger of destroying of thousands for whom Christ died, by broaching those errors and schismes: But this doth not infer, that therefore they for whom Christ died may perish, no more then that which Paul said (Acts 27.) Unless these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved: Though God had promised them all their lives, yet were in danger of perishing, if they stayed not in the ship. We may say, and we do teach a necessary connexion between the means and the end; that is, between faith and salvation; and so between unbelief and destruction: and this is no hinderance, but that we may say, that such a thing in natura sua is apt to produce such an end: though in respect of the over-ruling power, and counsell of God, it shall never do it. So these Errors and Heresies are in their own nature apt and fit to destroy, and drown soules in perdition, (even those for whom Christ died,) though God hath promised so to guide them by his grace, and holy Spirit, and to lead them into all truth, that the evil one shall not touch them, but that they shall persevere finally unto the end: There is a connexion between the means and the end: things may be apt and fit to indanger soules in respect of second causes, though there be no possibility for them to miscarry by them.

— M. Goodwin. What, though there be no possibility, can a man be in danger of miscarrying in that wherein there is no possibility of miscarrying?

M. Cranford. I deny your consequence; for all possibilities are not in regard of the decrees of God, but in respect of the second causes: for we know that all things are possible to God.

M. Goodwin. I have onely a word or two to speak more, and so I have done. Whereas you please to say, that I skip in M. Powell's Book, I professe I did not skip one word so farre as I read: That M. Powell may be of another mind in some other place (perhaps neare at hand) I deny not: And so I say, that these men are so contradictions and inconsistent with themselves, that it is a shame that men of learning, and parts, should speak at such a rate of contradiction as they do from time to time. And for that which you say concerning this, that there was never a Father, for the first 300. yeares after Christ that was of my judgment, you give that to Mr. Beza and Mr. Calvin, that they would

not

not have given to you. But I shall give an account of that to the world in due time. And as for the Lutherans, that they generally (I did not say all) hold these opinions, you may read Dr. *Prideaux*, he still joyns together the *Lutherans*, and *Arminians*, in these Questions, as his joyned adversaries.

*M. Simpson*. The controverſie between the Moderator, and *M. Goodwin*, is nothing to the preſent purpoſe; for we are not ſo much to conſider, what the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* hold, as what God holds forth in the Word of truth: And (I hope) it hath been proved, that the Tenets of *Mr. Goodwin* are contrary to that.

### F I N I S.

### Errata.

Page 16. l. 4. & 5. read *Adjective without a Substantive*. p. 33. l. 3. *Ministry* for *mystery*. p. 40. l. 6. for, *r. as*. p. 41. l. 30. *as*. *r. at*. p. 45. l. 17. *r. would not give*. p. 49. l. 27. *cancele*. *r. conceale*. *ibid.* l. 32, 33. *asserters*. *r. assertions*. p. 51. l. 37. *was*. *r. am*. p. 55. l. 21. *r. at*. *Exo. lxxv*. p. 75. at the end of l. 14. insert, *mind*, *why I should not explain*.







